S. HRG. 103-410

SCHOOL FINANCE EQUITY

Y 4.L 11/4:S.HRG.103-410

School Finance Equity, S.Hrg. 103-4...

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING THE QUESTION OF SCHOOL FINANCING AND THE EQUITY IN SCHOOL FINANCING, FOCUSING ON THE SYSTEM OF SCHOOL FUNDING IN ILLINOIS

OCTOBER 4, 1993

EAST ST. LOUIS, IL

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

SMITHSONIAN

MAR

PUBLIC LIBRARY

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

76-247 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-045861-7

S. HRG. 103-410

SCHOOL FINANCE EQUITY

Y 4.L 11/4:S.HRG.103-410

School Finance Equity, S.Hrg. 103-4...

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING THE QUESTION OF SCHOOL FINANCING AND THE EQUITY IN SCHOOL FINANCING, FOCUSING ON THE SYSTEM OF SCHOOL FUNDING IN ILLINOIS

OCTOBER 4, 1993

EAST ST. LOUIS, IL

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

76-247 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-045861-7

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania

NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
TOM HARKIN, Iowa

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, New Mexico

DAVID V. EVANS, *Staff Director*
PAM DEVITT, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1993

	Page
Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois	1
Tinder, Dr. Randy, superintendent of schools, Carlinville, IL; Natasha Rodgers and Angela White, students, Lansdowne Junior High School; Dr. Larry Hedges, professor, University of Chicago; and Dr. James Clayborne, director of research, evaluation, and testing, East St. Louis Community Unit District 189	3
Prepared statements:	
Dr. Tinder	7
Dr. Hedges	15
Jung, Greg, teacher, Kratz Elementary School; Dr. G. Alfred Hess, executive director, Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance; Anne Watkins, teacher, East St. Louis Senior High School; Don Baden, professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and associate dean, School of Education, SIU	33
Prepared statements:	
Mr. Jung	36
Dr. Hess	44
Mr. Baden	57
Boyd, Fred, president, School Board	69
Younge, Wyvetter H., representative	70
Thompson, Jr., Samuel, parent	72

SCHOOL FINANCE EQUITY

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1993

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
East St. Louis, IL.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. at Lansdowne Junior High School, East St. Louis, Illinois, (Senator Simon) presiding.

Present: Senator Simon.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR SIMON

Senator SIMON. The hearing will come to order.

We are pleased to have this hearing in East St. Louis. This is the fourth in a series of hearings that we are having of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Human Resources Committee on the question of school financing and the equity in school financing.

One of the goals of public education is to reduce the inequities into which we are born. The system of school funding in Illinois and too many other States perpetuates and even magnifies these inequities.

It is very interesting what happens in Sweden where you do not have the differences in terms of income that we do in the United States. But in Sweden, they have a policy of investing two to three times as much per pupil in areas of great need than they do in other areas. We, in fact, have stumbled into a system where we do precisely the opposite.

East St. Louis became the focus of some attention with Jonathan Kozol's book, "Savage Inequalities," but the problems are not just in East St. Louis. They are everywhere.

In Illinois—and we are excessively reliant on real estate taxes in Illinois, as well as some other States, in terms of supporting education. The per-student value of property in Illinois ranges from $5,445 to $880,974 per pupil. When you put in the State aid formula we run from $12,900 per pupil down to $2,100 per pupil. The distortions in our system are very, very real.

I have spent some time recently visiting 18 schools in the West Side and the South Side of Chicago. Just to get a comparison, I also spent 1 day in schools in New York City. New York City schools spend $2,800 per pupil more than in Chicago. There is no question that makes a difference in terms of educational opportunity.

I am not saying that money is the sole answer for the problems in education in our country, but we have to have more adequate resources. To visit schools in Chicago where students are working in workbooks where the questions have already been filled out the year before or 2 years before by other students, you just know we are not doing the kind of job that we ought to be doing. Or to visit one of the areas with the greatest of needs, where they have 730 students in one grade school and they have one counselor half-time in that grade school, you know we have to be doing better than that.

We recently passed a nonbinding resolution—the chief sponsor was Senator Jeffords of Vermont—saying let's increase 1 percent a year the amount of our budget that we devote to education. We have gone from fiscal year 1949 at the Federal level, where we devoted 9 percent of our Federal budget to education, now to the point where we are devoting 3 percent. And if we could set the right kind of priorities and next year go from 3 percent to 4 percent and the following year to 5 percent, we could gradually be doing some of the things that need to be done in our country.

We now spend about $30 billion. If we were to get over these next years up to 10 percent, that would mean $160 or $170 billion that we would be devoting to education. And that is essential.

I would add we also have to pay attention to the Federal fiscal problem. You can't run deficits and have interest being the fastest growing item in the Federal budget without hurting education and health care and a lot of other things. That is one of the things that we have to do.

Let me just comment, and I do not say this critically of Representative Wyvetter Younge, who is here. Wherever you are, Wyvetter, please stand. We are pleased, and we would be happy to have you join us up here at the head table and feel free to ask questions of our panelists also.

Ms. YOUNGE. Thank you very much. May I just sit here?

Senator SIMON. You may sit right there. You do whatever you feel comfortable doing. But we welcome you here.

Let me also acknowledge the presence of Martha O'Malley, the county superintendent—I still say county superintendent of schools, but whatever that new title is, anyway, Martha O'Malley, we are very pleased to have you here also, as well as members of the school board. Mr. Duckworth has been my host this morning as we have—right back there, yes. Thank you very, very much.

In terms of effort relative to income—and this is for school year 1991-92—Illinois, as they calculate these things, is at 21.8. States near us, Indiana is at 30.8, almost 50 percent better; Iowa, 23.7; Kentucky, 25.8; Missouri is only slightly better than we are, 22.0. But every State is doing a better job. Again, I don't mean this critically of Wyvetter Younge, who has been in there fighting for this cause. But when you look at what other industrial States are doing—New York, 30.1; Ohio, 25.4; Pennsylvania, 29.3; and Wisconsin, another neighboring State, 28.2—clearly we have to be doing better.

When we look at States that are doing worse, I find two States: Alabama, 21.2, and Tennessee. We simply have to do better in this State, and we have to do better in the Nation.

We are pleased to have a number of witnesses here. Our first witnesses are Dr. James Clayborne, the director of research, evaluation and testing of East St. Louis Community Unit District 189; Natasha Rodgers, who is a student—and we are pleased particularly to have a student here—at Lansdowne Junior High School where we are meeting right now; Dr. Randy Tinder, the superintendent of schools in Carlinville, IL; and Dr. Larry Hedges, professor at the University of Chicago who specializes in looking at this particular problem.

We will try to follow the 5-minute rule, and we will enter your full statements in the record. Let me acknowledge also Alice Johnson of my staff who has been working on this, as has Bob Shireman, another staff member who is not here. I appreciate our hosts everywhere here for being here and for what you are contributing.

If the four can join us here, the four witnesses I just mentioned. Randy Tinder and Larry Hedges. Are James Clayborne and Natasha Rodgers here? They apparently are not here at this point. We will proceed with Dr. Randy Tinder. We will hear from you first.

STATEMENTS OF DR. RANDY TINDER, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, CARLINVILLE, IL; NATASHA RODGERS AND ANGELA WHITE, STUDENTS, LANSDOWNE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL; DR. LARRY HEDGES, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO; AND DR. JAMES CLAYBORNE, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, EVALUATION, AND TESTING, EAST ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT 189

Dr. TINDER. Thank you, Senator, and good morning.

As you mentioned, I am the superintendent of schools in Carlinville, IL, and I serve as chairman of the Committee for Educational Rights. The committee is the group of 70 school districts that is suing the State of Illinois over the way schools are funded here.

This morning I won't attempt to try to impress you with my legal knowledge because I have none, and I won't try to explain the finer points of our case. But I do want to talk to you about the crisis in school funding in Illinois.

School boards and school superintendents typically are very conservative; however, the decline in the State support of education over the past 15 years has caused us to take rather drastic action. In November of 1990, we filed suit against the State asking the courts to declare the current method of funding education in Illinois unconstitutional.

Illinois relies primarily on property taxes as the basis for school funding. Now, that is fine if you happen to live in an area that is property rich; however, if you live and go to school in an area that does not have a great deal of property wealth, then you may receive educational opportunities that are far less than what you should have.

The disparity in spending per pupil in Illinois has been as wide as $10,000 or more. Some districts have had as little as $2,000 per pupil to spend while others have spent over $12,000. In fact, there

are some districts in which the potential access to dollars is mind-boggling.

We believe that our Constitution makes education as fundamental a right as there is and that all children should have equal educational opportunities. As we sit here today in East St. Louis, I am struck by remembrances of Kozol's book. Reading the first two chapters will give you a good perspective on the opportunities available for children in East St. Louis and Chicago. It is——

Senator SIMON. Let me just interrupt for a moment. I think Natasha is back here. Natasha, you come up and join us here at the table, if you will. Natasha, come on up and join us here, all right? And Dr. Clayborne is here, too. Please join us, Dr. Clayborne. All right. We are going to have two students here instead of one. Dr. Clayborne, if you can pull up a seat there, too.

I apologize for interrupting you here, Dr. Tinder.

Dr. TINDER. No problem.

What Kozol's book does not do, however, is highlight the plight of many rural school districts in Illinois which are struggling to hang on to their local schools and being forced into virtual bankruptcy. A staggering number of the State school districts had been identified by the State board of education as having financial woes which range from perilous to impossible. Meanwhile, the General Assembly and the Governor are unable to muster the political will to do what is right; that is, to bring support up to a level which allows for real equality of educational opportunities.

We find this situation ironic since a Federal judge dismissed our lawsuit in December of 1992 and stated that the judiciary should not meddle in a task that belongs to the legislature. I contend that if someone doesn't start meddling soon, there won't be anything left to meddle with.

The defendants in this suit, the State board of education and the Governor, have repeatedly said that they agree that the current system is not fair, yet the State continues to spend its money fighting our effort instead of seeking resolution. In the meantime, we continue to invest our district's funds in an appeal of this case because there is no other hope for resolution of this funding crisis in Illinois.

Blue-ribbon panels, commissions, and task forces come and go, but nothing significant changes. The current Governor has consistently given what he can to education in his budgeting, but this does not change the fact that the system discriminates on the basis of wealth. The range of opportunities for children in Illinois continues to widen.

In all too many schools in Illinois, there are no computers for children to learn to use while in other districts computers are introduced at the kindergarten level. Too many districts are using textbooks that are 10 or more years out of date. Too many health textbooks are being used that were published before we knew anything about AIDS. Too many school buildings are in a dismal State of repair or are bursting at the seams without children. How long can we continue to let this happen?

People continually tell us that you can't fix education by throwing money at it. I have a couple of responses to that. First, I don't

think education is broken in general. I think, rather, it is malnourished.

Second, I would agree that money doesn't guarantee better test scores, but it certainly can provide better opportunities for children. Having great science labs and equipment may not guarantee that a child will learn more in chemistry, but if his or her school can't afford science labs and equipment, we can guarantee they won't be proficient in chemistry.

I would say give us the money to provide opportunities and we will be happy to let you hold our feet to the fire on achievement.

In Illinois, school funding is always the last piece of the budget to be resolved. All other areas cut up the revenue pie, and schools get what is left. However, all of our politicians say that education is their top priority. What is wrong with this picture?

Even after the November 1992 election in which a proposed constitutional amendment to make education a fundamental right garnered over 57 percent of the vote, nothing significant happened. The Federal Government, however, has been a stable and reliable source of funds for Illinois' schools. Even though only 8 to 10 percent of our total funding comes from Federal sources, we can depend on getting what we are promised. Currently State revenues are late, pro-rated, and unreliable.

Since we are educating children who will be citizens of our Nation as well as our State, there is a strong reason for more Federal funding of local schools. Most of our Federal funds go to providing opportunities for selected groups of children who have special needs, such as low-income families or children with special ed problems. Perhaps the Federal Government should take a look at its contribution to the education of the majority of our students who receive very little impact from Federal dollars. Our gifted population could benefit from an infusion of new dollars.

If a significant amount of Federal dollars were available to my district without an endless web of restrictions on use, we could put these dollars to work helping counsel our students whose homes are in turmoil. We could provide for early intervention by serving all of our 3- or 4-year-old children who are at risk of academic failure. We could install high-tech equipment to make the world a classroom for our children.

We are determined to do these things in Carlinville somehow and someday, but in the meantime, opportunities are passing our children by.

You as a Senator represent not only Illinois but also the children of the whole country. You must be aware that school funding problems are not limited to Illinois. Indeed, many States have gone through the same expensive, time-consuming legal struggle in which we are now engaged. In the meantime, our children are losing their chance at an education that can't prepare them to take over the leadership of our country 1 day.

We would call upon you to use your stature and influence to help us make education a fundamental right in the United States and to ensure that funding schools will be the first budget priority not only in Springfield, IL, but in Washington, DC. We cannot prepare students to turn the corner and enter the next century with atti-

tudes about education and funding mechanisms that are mired in the middle of the past century.

We have all seen the poster that suggests that it would be a wonderful world if schools had all the money they need and the Pentagon had to have a bake sale to buy a bomber. We have all heard that a mind is a terrible thing to waste. We all know that children cannot achieve unless they have a fair chance to do so. The Committee for Educational Rights and similar groups across the country are engaged in a struggle to provide equal educational opportunity for everyone. We ask for your help.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Dr. Tinder.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Tinder follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. RANDOLPH L. TINDER

Good morning. I am Randy Tinder. I am the Superintendent of Schools in Carlinville, Illinois and Chairman of the *Committee for Educational Rights*. The *Committee for Educational Rights* is the group of 70 public school districts that has brought suit against the State of Illinois because of the way schools are funded.

I will not attempt to impress you this morning with my legal knowledge or the fine points of our case, but rather I want to talk to you about the condition of school funding in Illinois.

School Superintendents and Boards of Education are generally very conservative. The decline in state support of education over the past 15 years has caused us to take a most radical action. In November of 1990 we filed suit asking that the current method of funding education in Illinois be declared unconstitutional. Illinois relies primarily on property taxes as the basis for school funding. This is fine if you happen to live in an area that is property rich. However, if you live, and go to school, in an area that does not have a great deal of property wealth, you may receive educational opportunities that are far less than you should have. The disparity in spending per pupil in Illinois has been as wide as $10,000 or more. Some districts have had as little as $2,000 per pupil to spend, while other have spent over $12,000. In fact, there are districts where the potential access to dollars is mind-boggling.

We believe that our constitution makes education as fundamental a right as there is and that all children should have equal educational opportunities. As we sit here today in East St. Louis I am struck by remembrances of Jonathan Kozol's book, *Savage Inequalities*. Reading the first two chapters of this book will give you a good perspective on the opportunities available for children in East St. Louis and Chicago. It is startling reading. What Kozol's book does not do, however, is highlight the plight of the many rural school districts in this state which are struggling to hang on to their local schools and being forced into virtual bankruptcy. A staggering number of the state's school districts have been identified by the State Board of Education as having financial woes which range from perilous to impossible. Meanwhile, the General Assembly and the Governor are unable to muster the political will to do what is right, that is to bring state support up to a level which allows for real equality of educational opportunities. We find this situation ironic since a federal judge dismissed our lawsuit in the summer of 1992 and stated that the judiciary should not meddle in a task that belongs to the

legislature. I contend that if someone does not move this problem off dead center before long there may not be anything significant left to attend to. The defendants in this suit, the State Board of Education and the Governor, have said repeatedly that they agree that the current system is not fair. Yet the State continues to spend its money fighting our effort instead of seeking resolution. In the meantime we continue to invest our district's funds in an appeal of this case because there is no other hope for a solution to this funding crisis in Illinois.

Blue ribbon panels, commissions and task forces come and go, but nothing significant changes. The current Governor has consistently given whatever he can to education in his budgeting, but this does not change the fact the system discriminates on the basis of wealth. The range of opportunities for children continues to widen. In all too many schools in Illinois there are no computers for children to learn to use, while in others computers are introduced at Kindergarten. Too many districts are using textbooks that are ten or more years out of date. Too many health textbooks are being used that were published before we knew about AIDS. Too many school buildings are in a dismal state of repair or are bursting at the seams with students. How long can we continue to allow this to happen?

People continually tell us that you can't fix education by throwing money at it. I have a couple of responses. First I don't believe that education in general is broken, but rather it is malnourished! Second I would agree that more money doesn't guarantee better scores, but it certainly can provide for more opportunities for our children. Having great science labs and equipment may not guarantee that a child will learn more in chemistry, but if his or her school cannot afford science labs then we can guarantee that the student won't be proficient in chemistry! I say give us the money to provide opportunities and we will be happy to have you hold our feet to the fire on achievement.

In Illinois school funding is always the last piece of the budget to be resolved. All other areas cut up the revenue pie and schools get what is left. However, all of our politicians say that education is their top priority. What's wrong with this picture? Even after the November 1992 election, in which a proposed constitutional amendment to make education a fundamental right garnered over 57% of the vote, nothing significant has happened.

The federal government has been a stable and reliable source of funds for Illinois schools. Even though only 8% - 10% of our total funding comes

from federal sources, we can depend on getting what we are promised. Currently the state revenues are late, prorated and unreliable. Since we are educating children who will be citizens of our nation as well as our state, there is a strong reason for more federal funding of local schools. Most of our federal funds go to providing opportunities for selected groups of children who have specific needs, such as children from low income families or children who have special education needs. Perhaps the federal government should take a look at its contribution to the education of the majority of our students who receive very little impact from federal dollars. Our gifted population could also benefit from an infusion of new dollars. If a significant amount of federal dollars were available to my district without an endless web of restrictions on use, we could put these dollars to work helping counsel our students whose homes are in turmoil. We could provide for early intervention by serving all of our three and four year old children who are at risk of academic failure. We could install high tech equipment to make the world a classroom for our children. We are determined to do these things in Carlinville somehow and some day, but in the meantime we are allowing these opportunities to pass by so many children.

You, as Senators, represent not only the children of Illinois, but of the whole country. You must be aware that school funding problems are not limited to Illinois. Indeed many states have gone through the same expensive, time-consuming legal struggle in which we are now engaged. In the meantime, our children are losing their chance at an education that can prepare them to take over the leadership of our country one day. We would call upon you to use your stature and influence to help us to make education a fundamental right in the United States and to ensure that funding schools will be the first budget priority not only in Springfield, Illinois, but in Washington, D.C. We cannot prepare students to turn the corner and enter the next century with attitudes about education and funding mechanisms that are mired in the middle of the previous century.

We have all seen the poster that suggests that it would be a wonderful world if schools had all of the money they need and the Pentagon had to have a bake sale to buy a bomber. We have heard that a mind is a terrible thing to waste. We all know that children cannot achieve unless they have a fair chance to do so. The Committee for Educational Rights and similar groups around the country are engaged in a struggle to provide equal educational opportunity for everyone. We ask for your help.

Thank you.

Senator SIMON. I might mention one other thing I should have mentioned in my opening remarks. We will be reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act early next year, and one of the reasons for this hearing and other hearings on this subject is to see what we can do to not only provide greater Federal resources, but what we can do to stimulate States to provide assistance on a more equitable basis. And while our hearing is here in East St. Louis, there is no question we have a lot of rural schools that also face very severe problems.

Before I call on anyone else, let me call on—we are joined not only by Natasha Rodgers, but apparently another student here. Let's hear from both students, and then we will hear from Dr. Hedges and Dr. Clayborne. Natasha, can we hear from you first?

Ms. Rodgers. Sure. Good morning, fellow students, Lansdowne faculty, and distinguished Members of Congress and other guests. My name is Natasha Rodgers.

Ms. White. And my name is Angela White.

Ms. Rodgers. We are both 9th grade students here at Lansdowne Junior High School. We are very happy to have you here this morning.

For many inner-city students coming from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, the public school system is the only way up and out. Without sufficient funding, the public school system will not be able to function effectively. As a result, many of us would be deprived of a quality education; with sufficient funding, we can equip ourselves to become productive members of society. In fact, if it wasn't for public schools, we would not be standing here before you today for our parents aren't fortunate enough to send us to private schools.

School District 189 varies in many ways from those of the Bilbee area and other areas in the State of Illinois. Some of the junior high schools look more like colleges. In their schools, they have all of the materials, perhaps even more, that they need. Such materials are xerox paper, chalk, computers, etc. We are appreciative for the computers that we have received this year, but there is not enough for the amount of students that desire to take computer courses.

The teachers often don't have enough xerox paper to make enough copies for all of their students. Therefore, the students have to copy everything down on their own paper. The time spent copying down the work can be time spent learning.

Another important concern is the books. The books that we use are not current. Not only are they old, but they are also damaged. We need new books because every day is history. The condition of the books can discourage students from wanting to learn.

The libraries in our schools also need expanding. We need more encyclopedias and dictionaries because we don't have enough. And the ones that we do have often don't have the current information that you are looking for.

We also need more teachers. There are some students who don't have teachers, and in some schools, there are vacant classrooms because there aren't enough teachers. By there being a shortage of teachers, the class sizes are often too large. When this happens, there are students in some classes that can't learn as fast as oth-

ers. As a result, the teacher has to take time with those slower students, and this takes away from those who are capable of learning. If there were more teachers, everyone could be placed in a class with students of their own pace.

Ms. White. As you might know——

Senator SIMON. What is your name, before you start?

Ms. White. Angela White.

Senator SIMON. OK.

Ms. White. As you might know, we the youth are falling out of our society like flies. Not only should there be more funds for academic activities, but extracurricular activities as well. Without the money to finance extracurricular activities, the kids have nothing to look forward to. We hardly have any sports. Not everyone is interested in football, basketball, volleyball, and track. Only in senior high schools do we have sports like swimming, tennis, and softball. There are also not enough clubs that the kids can belong to. After school, the first thing they do is run to the streets or a corner liquor store. If there is more funding for school activities, then the youth wouldn't have to turn to the streets. Band is a good activity to consider, but without enough money for instruments, stands, etc, there is no band.

There are also improvements that need to be made in schools like the bathrooms. In some schools, the bathrooms don't even have doors, or the ones that have doors don't have toilets in them. Some of the lights don't have covers on them. The lights may be loose, and they could shatter. That is not securing the well-being of the people. The lights should also be replaced because a lot of the lights don't work, and the classes may be too dim. Some teachers have to use light from outside, which isn't enough for the human eye.

We also need air conditioning in the schools. In the spring, it gets entirely too hot in the classrooms. It is unbearable when you are trying to work in the heat. It is also hard to concentrate.

Not all the changes that need to be made are the responsibilities of the school and school districts, but of us the students as well. We must also cooperate if we want these things to happen.

Some students don't know the value of education. Some people think that school is the place where you come to socialize or just something to do. We must learn to take school more seriously.

Let me conclude by saying that the United States Constitution guarantees all American citizens the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. How can we be happy when we know that our country is one of the most prosperous nations in the world, but our educational system is struggling? We really do hope that we have convinced you, and we hope that you reconsider increasing the amount of funds for public schools.

Senator SIMON. We thank you both. [Applause.]

Let me ask you first, what do the two of you want to eventually become?

Ms. Rodgers. I want to become a lawyer when I grow up.

Senator SIMON. OK. Wyvetter Younge, you have got some competition coming.

Angela, what do you want to become?

Ms. White. I also want to become a lawyer.

Senator SIMON. Two future lawyers here. Well, we need good teachers and doctors and nurses and a lot of other professions, too, but we are very pleased.

You mentioned computers, Natasha.

Ms. Rodgers. Yes.

Senator SIMON. Let me ask Angela and Natasha, have you worked on computers?

Ms. Rodgers. No. I wanted to take computer courses this semester and school year, but, unfortunately, the classes were too large, so I couldn't get in.

Senator SIMON. You haven't been able to?

Ms. Rodgers. No.

Senator SIMON. And you are in what grade?

Ms. Rodgers. 9th.

Senator SIMON. 9th grade. You see, the majority of young people in the 9th grade have had a chance now to work with computers, and we want to make sure that you have that chance. Technology is your friend if you are prepared. Technology is your enemy if you are not prepared. That is why school is so important for the two of you.

What about you, Angela? Have you had a chance to work with computers?

Ms. White. I am taking a business course. We have computers in the classroom, but we haven't started working on them yet.

Senator SIMON. Do you mean by that you have very limited use of the computer? Is that right?

Ms. White. Excuse me?

Senator SIMON. Do you actually get to use the computers?

Ms. White. No.

Senator SIMON. You just learned about computers?

Ms. White. Yes.

Senator SIMON. OK. I didn't know the background of either of you, but I mention it just because in the day and age in which we live. What grade are you in, Angela?

Ms. White. 9th.

Senator SIMON. 9th also. Ninth graders simply have to be equipped in this way, and we hope before you get into high school you will have a chance on those computers. I say this as one who still uses an old manual typewriter, I hate to say. But it is a different age in which you are growing up.

Well, we thank you both very, very much, and we will excuse the two of you and let you get back to—what class are you going back to?

Ms. Rodgers. Second hour.

Senator SIMON. What?

Ms. Rodgers. Second hour.

Senator SIMON. Second hour. What do you have in the second hour?

Ms. Rodgers. Biology.

Senator SIMON. Biology. You like biology?

Ms. Rodgers. Yes.

Senator SIMON. Are you doing pretty well there?

Ms. Rodgers. Yes, sir.

Senator SIMON. Good for you. What about you, Angela?

Ms. White. Yes.

Senator SIMON. Are you going to biology also?

Ms. White. Yes.

Senator SIMON. OK. Well, good luck to both of you, and we thank you very, very much for being here.

Ms. Rodgers. Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Thank you. [Applause.]

Now we will get back to our less expert witnesses here. Dr. Hedges, we will call on you.

Dr. HEDGES. Thank you, Senator. I am——

Senator SIMON. I think we have the P.A. system working here now, so you may pull that over here.

Dr. HEDGES. Good. Is that better? Yes, I think it is.

Senator SIMON. I guess that one is the one. If you can just pull that over.

Dr. HEDGES. Good. That sounds functional.

Thank you, Senator. I am a professor of education and social sciences at the University of Chicago. I am principally an applied statistician by training, and one of my specialties has been the development of methods for combining evidence from multiple research studies of the same topic. But like other professors of education, I am also concerned with the problem of improving American education and the role of financing in school reform.

During the last 30 years, social scientists have attempted to elucidate the broad outlines of the relation between resource inputs to schools and educational outcomes by systematic research studies of so-called education production functions. I would like to confine most of my remarks to that research literature and what implications it may have for considerations of school finance.

During the last 15 years, economists have attempted to summarize the findings of this research tradition. It came as something of a surprise when reviewers of the research literature on production functions, most notably Eric Hanushek, reached the counterintuitive conclusion that there is no systematic relation between resource inputs to schools and educational outcomes. And I believe you heard testimony from Dr. Hanushek to that effect. In essence, they concluded that the research suggests that money doesn't matter.

It is interesting that there has been a parallel set of developments that have implications for this finding. In the last 15 years, the statistical community has begun to better appreciate the technical difficulties of summarizing evidence from collections of research studies. We have discovered the seemingly sensible ways of summarizing findings across studies can lead to profoundly incorrect conclusions. More adequate methods for summarizing research findings for many studies have been developed, and there is now a substantial degree of consensus in the field on the essential aspects of their use.

I believe that the reason that resources have seemed unrelated to educational outcomes is that reviewers of this research have used outdated and subtly flawed methods of summarizing evidence across studies. And this is not to impugn either the character or the competence of the researchers involved in those reviews but,

rather, that the field has changed recently and we now know some things that we didn't about summarizing research.

My student colleagues Richard Lane, Rob Greenwald, and I have recently reviewed the very same collection of research studies most often used to demonstrate that money doesn't matter. We have identified specific technical problems in previous reviews and shown why these technical problems lead to the finding of no effective resources on outcomes. We have also applied more valid synthesis methods to this evidence and demonstrated that it points to quite a different conclusion than Hanushek and others have found.

In fact, there is strong evidence that resources are positively related to educational outcomes, and the magnitude of this relation is large enough to be practically important. Thus, the research evidence is consistent with the conclusion that additional resources would lead to more effective schools and not to the counterintuitive proposition that additional resources would be ineffective. And I might add that we have reached these conclusions based on precisely the same evidence that has been used by others.

I am not suggesting that haphazardly increasing school funding levels is the wisest or the most efficient way to improve our Nation's schools. However, I am arguing that educational research provides no basis for eliminating revenue sufficiency from the discussion of how to improve schools.

The existing research evidence is not well suited to deriving detailed and specific conclusions about the kinds of resource allocations that are most cost-efficient. In research on educational finance, we badly need better data on the details of resource allocation and outcomes. The Federal role in the development of better educational data is particularly important because more adequate data will have to be national in scope and collected using the same categories over time to permit longitudinal comparisons as well as cross-sectional comparisons.

The development of more adequate data will involve costs, but the benefit will be evidence that can better inform the work of policymakers concerned with educational finance.

Thank you.

Senator SIMON. We thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Hedges follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. LARRY HEDGES

Although public debate about the need for improvement in the American educational system has vigorously continued over the past decade, no consensus exists on what course should be followed or even that additional expenditures are necessary to produce the desired improvements. In fact, some scholars have questioned whether there is a relation between the amount of resources and level of accomplishment of students in schools (Hanushek, 1981, 1986, 1989, 1991). Given tightening state budgets and questions about the efficacy of public schools, evidence that school expenditures are unrelated to student performance has deflected attention from the question of revenue sufficiency in discussions of the manner in which education may be improved. This work has been the pillar upon which the counter-intuitive notion that money does not matter in schools has been constructed. Yet the data upon which this conclusion is based support exactly the opposite conclusion, and demonstrate that expenditures are positively related to school outcomes.

During the last year we have conducted a reanalysis of the evidence examined by Hanushek in his influential synthesis of the literature on the relations between school inputs and student performance. Although there are weaknesses in some of the studies Hanushek utilizes, for the purposes of our work, we accepted the validity of Hanushek's formulation of the problem to be investigated (e. g., his definition of characteristics of schools and families, student output, the general model specification that he required,[1] and his sample of studies. Setting aside the weaknesses of Hanushek's sample of studies, we focus on the data analysis and interpretation stages of Hanushek's research synthesis. The key question we examine is whether Hanushek's conclusions about the lack of relation between school inputs and student outcomes and particularly his general conclusion that per pupil expenditure (PPE) and achievement are unrelated, are supported by a synthesis of the results of his sample of studies using more sophisticated statistical methods.

Education Production Functions as Models

The dominant paradigm utilized in analyzing the effects of educational resources on student outcomes over the last few decades has been the education production function. Production-function studies attempt to derive a model of the relation between

---

[1]Hanushek defines a qualified study as a "production-function estimate that is: (1) published in a book or refereed journal; (2) relates some objective measure of student output to characteristics of the family and the schools attended; and (3) provides information about the statistical significance of estimated relationships." (Hanushek, 1989, p. 80, f. 5)

educational inputs and outcomes.[1] The goal of such studies is to develop quantitative models which allow one to predict the effect on student outcomes of a given change in resources. For example, a production-function could predict how much the mean achievement on a standardized test would change if per-pupil expenditures were increased by $100. Similarly, it might enable the identification of the most cost effective means to improve public education.

Attention was focused on the production-function approach by the landmark study Equality of Educational Opportunity, also referred to as the Coleman Report. Although the Coleman Report is the best known study of this type, there have been a large number of other studies and synopses (see Averch et al., 1972; Heim & Perl, 1974; Glasman & Biniaminov, 1981; or Murnane, 1981). Although broad guidelines regarding the specification of models have evolved, no consensus on the exact specification of the educational production-function, and more specifically, on how to measure school resources, student characteristic variables, or the outcome measures used in these production-functions, has emerged.

The Sample of Studies

Hanushek has completed the most comprehensive and important synthesis of the existing research on educational production-functions to date. In a series of articles over the past decade, Hanushek utilized data from 38 different articles or books and focused on seven school inputs: teacher/pupil ratio, teacher education, teacher experience, teacher salary, PPE, administrative inputs, and facilities. Each publication may have several regression equations involving different samples of students, input variables, or outcomes for a total of 187 equations. Each equation may have one or more partial regression coefficients which are counted in the vote count.

Hanushek classified the relation between each input variable and an output variable into one of 5 categories according to the direction of the coefficient's sign (positive or negative) and its statistical significance (significant or non-significant). The fifth category contains coefficients which were non-significant but where it was impossible to determine the direction of the coefficient's sign from the reported results. Due to the limited information provided by this fifth category, it is deleted in our reanalysis of Hanushek's research.

---

[1]Inputs include school resources such as expenditures, teacher characteristics, facilities, and student characteristics such as socioeconomic status or ability. Outcomes include achievement as measured by standardized tests, future educational patterns, and adult earnings.

Hanushek's Conclusions

Through his tally method, Hanushek showed (see Table 1) that as few as 7 percent (8 of 113) of the relations between an input and an outcome were positive and statistically significant (in the case of teacher education), and at most 28 percent (40 of 140) were positive and statistically significant (in the case of teacher experience). Hanushek concluded that relatively few of the studies yielded results that were both positive and statistically significant and that

> the results are startlingly consistent in finding no strong evidence that teacher-student ratios, teacher education, or teacher experience have the expected positive effects on student achievement ...[A]dministration and facilities also show no systematic relationships with performance (Hanushek, 1989, p. 47).

When he examined the relation between the most general measure of resource inputs, PPE, and student outcome, he found 20 percent (13 of 65) of the relations to be positive and statistically significant. From this percentage, Hanushek came to his now widely cited conclusion that "there is no strong or systematic relationship between school expenditures and student performance" (Hanushek, 1989, p. 47).[3]

INSERT TABLE 1

Problems with the Hanushek Review

Before we explore the statistical problems of combining evidence across studies, we may analyse Hanushek's conclusions on a more basic level. The pattern of results given in Hanushek's vote count is not consistent with the null hypothesis of no effect in every study.

For example, if PPE and educational outcome were truly unrelated in every study, 50 percent of the studies would be expected to obtain positive relations and 50 percent negative relations by chance. In addition, only 5 percent of the studies would obtain results that were statistically significant, with that 5 percent evenly divided between positive and negative relations. For the portion of Hanushek's data in which the direction could be determined,

[3]Note: The percentages in this paragraph were calculated by including Hanushek's category of non-significant coefficients with an unknown direction of its sign.

far greater percentages of the results are positive (as much as 70%, in the case of PPE) than one would expect from chance alone.[4] Moreover, a far greater percentage of all of his coefficients are statistically significant (as much as 36% in the case of teacher experience). Studies with either positive or negative significant relations between a resource input and educational outcome were found in as few as 13% of the studies (for administrative inputs), and as many as 36% (for teacher experience) excluding those studies with unknown signs. Thus the percentage of studies having significant coefficients ranged from 2.5 to 7 times the 5 percent that would be expected due to chance alone if resource inputs and outcomes were truly unrelated. This basic statistical analysis undermines Hanushek's conclusion that these data provide that there is no systematic relationship between expenditures and performance.

The analytic method that Hanushek used is often called vote-counting (Light & Smith, 1971). For a given resource input, the "result" of each study is the estimated partial regression coefficient of the resource input on student output, holding constant family background and other inputs. The vote counting methodology tabulates these results according to the sign (positive, negative, or unknown) and the statistical significance (significant or non-significant, usually at the α=.05 level) of the results. The category with the most results (the most "votes") is generally taken to represent the true state of the relation in question.

Despite the intuitive appeal of vote counting as a summary procedure, it has serious failings as an inference procedure. The most obvious shortcoming is that regardless of whether vote counting may identify if a relation exists, it cannot provide an indication of its magnitude. More serious weaknesses of the vote count method were identified by mathematical studies of the properties of vote counting as a decision procedure. Even when an effect is present in every study, vote counting typically has very low power (prone to type II error) to detect the effects (Hedges & Olkin, 1980). Moreover when effects are relatively small, which is quite common in social science research, and the individual study sample sizes are small to moderate, vote counting has a paradoxical property: the probability that a vote count will correctly detect an effect that is present in every study tends to zero as the number of studies increases (Hedges & Olkin, 1980).

The structure of Hanushek's argument is essentially one of accepting (at least approximately) a null hypothesis after

---

[4] Baker (1991) previously noted that there were more positive and statistically significant results for PPE than would be expected from chance alone.

attempts to reject it have failed.[3] The credibility of such arguments depend on the strength of the methods used in the attempt to falsify the null hypothesis. The probability of making an error in reaching the conclusion to "accept" the null hypothesis depends on the power of the tests used in the attempt to reject it. Because vote counting has such low power as an inference procedure, the failure to reject a null hypothesis using this procedure is not persuasive evidence that the null hypothesis is even approximately true.

The problem of combining evidence across different empirical research studies to draw general conclusions, often called meta-analysis or research synthesis, has received considerable attention over the past 15 years (see, e. g., Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981; Cooper, 1984; Light & Pillemer, 1984; or Hedges & Olkin, 1985). Much of this work has concentrated on developing methods for conducting research syntheses that will reduce the threats to their validity. Some, but certainly not all, of this work has focused on the analytic methods used to combine empirical evidence across studies.

Reanalysis Methodology

We attempted to replicate Hanushek's selection of coefficients to be counted in each input category and then used these coefficients or their p-values in our analyses. Table 1 presents the tabulation of results given by Hanushek and those obtained in our reanalysis. The close agreement between our sample tally (specifically in the PPE category) and that of Hanushek, after deleting those tallies which were classified as non-significant with an unknown sign, suggests that any differences in overall results should be primarily consequences of the analytic methods used. We also examined a sub-sample of the studies in which the outcome was a measure of achievement which will be discussed later.

There are two general classes of statistical methods in meta-analysis: combined significance tests and combined estimation methods. Both were used in our reanalysis.

Combined significance tests. A combined significance test is a way of combining statistical significance values (p-values) from studies which test the same conceptual hypothesis, but which use different designs (e. g., levels of

---

[3]While orthodox treatments of the logic of statistical inference do not condone accepting the null hypothesis, the practice is routine and we would argue, defensible in many circumstances. Our criticism is not with the practice itself, but with the failure to recognize that powerful tests of the hypothesis are needed to make acceptance of the null hypothesis credible.

aggregation or specification) or may measure the outcome variables differently (e. g., standardized tests which differ in subject) to obtain an overall level of significance for the collection of studies under consideration. Such tests allow one to determine if the data are consistent with the null hypothesis in all studies or if the data suggest that the null hypothesis is false in at least some of the studies.

Although there are many combined significance tests, we chose the inverse chi-square (Fisher) method because it has sound technical properties and is widely used in statistics (see Hedges & Olkin, 1985, chapter 3). We tested two null hypotheses for each of Hanushek's resource input variables:

(a) the positive case--where the null hypothesis is that there is no positive relation between the resource and output, and

(b) the negative case--where the null hypothesis is that there is no negative relation between the resource and output.

Note that combined significance tests are not designed to support inferences about the size of the average effect or about the consistency of effects across studies. It is entirely possible to reject the null hypothesis in both the positive and negative cases, which would mean that there is evidence of both some negative and some positive relations. However, in order to reach the conclusion that "no strong or systematic relationship" exists between the major educational inputs to schooling and student outcome, the data would have to be consistent with the null hypothesis in both the positive and negative case.

Effect magnitude analyses. Because output variables were not measured on the same scale in all studies, the partial regression coefficients for the resource input variables could not be combined directly. Consequently all of our indices of relations predicted standardized output, that is output in standard deviation units.

Two of the resource input variables (PPE and teacher salary) were initially measured in dollars and hence were directly comparable, or could be made so after a correction for inflation.[1] For these resource inputs, the measure of relation or effect magnitude was a "half standardized" partial

---

[1]In this analysis the dollar value of PPE and teacher salary in each study was adjusted to 1991 dollars using the Elementary and Secondary Price Index for the year in which the data were collected. See The Digest of Education Statistics, 1992.

regression coefficient.[7] The half standardized regression coefficient measures the number of standard deviations of change in output produced by a one unit (one dollar in this case) change in input.

The other resource inputs were measured in ways that could not readily be placed on the same scale. For these inputs, the index of effect magnitude was the fully standardized regression coefficient. This coefficient measures the number of standard deviations of change in output which would be produced by a one standard deviation change in input.

Results

Our analyses clearly shows systematic positive patterns in the relations between educational resource inputs and student outcomes. It must be remembered that our conclusions are dependent on the use of the sample population of studies initially identified by Hanushek. Using the research synthesis methodology detailed here on a more recent and more stringently defined sample of production-function studies which overcome the weaknesses of Hanushek's universe of studies. This would provide a more definitive answer to the impact of educational inputs on student outcomes.

Combined significance tests. The results of the combined significance tests for the coefficients in the sample are reported in Table 2. In order to reach conclusions that increasing one of the input variables will improve the student outcome measure, we would expect to reject the null hypothesis in the positive direction.[8] The panel of results on the left side of Table 2 concern tests of the null hypothesis that there is no positive relation between resource inputs and student outcomes. In other words, these results will tell us if at least one study contains a positive relation between an educational input and student outcome.

---

[7] The half standardized regression coefficient β_s is defined as $\beta_s = \beta/\beta_0$ where β is the unstandardized regression coefficient and β_0 is the standard deviation of the output variable.

[8] Because the studies combined the input variables of teacher/pupil ratio and class size (pupil/teacher ratio) in the teacher/pupil ratio category, we performed both a combined and distinct analysis of each variable. Since these two variables are inversely related, a positive relation for the variable teacher/pupil ratio and a negative relation for class size (pupil/teacher ratio) correspond to essentially the same conclusion.

Reviewing the combined significance tests for the positive case, we see that all of the combined p-values are significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. This result holds in the complete sample, the sample restricted to achievement outcomes, and the conservatively independent sample. It holds for every one of the robustness samples, except for facilities and every one of the samples containing the middle 90% of the p-values except for facilities and teacher/pupil ratio, where the results are not significant. Thus, these data imply that over all the studies, with the exceptions noted above, there are at least some positive relations between each of the types of educational resource inputs studied and student outcome.

INSERT TABLE 2

The panel of results on the right side of Table 2 concern tests of the null hypothesis that there is no negative relation between resource inputs and student outcomes. In other words, these results will tell us if at least one study contains a negative relation between an educational input and student outcome. The pattern of the combined significance test results for the negative case are slightly more complex.

For the input variables PPE and teacher experience, none of the combined p-values are significant. This suggests that there is no statistically reliable evidence of negative relations between these two resource inputs and student outcome. Taken together with the results of the combined significance tests in the positive case above, these results suggest that since there are positive relations between outcome and both PPE and teacher experience, but there are no negative relations between outcome and either of these two resource inputs, the typical relation is positive. This would suggest that Hanushek's sample of studies supports the conclusion that increasing expenditures and teacher experience will increase student outcome.

The resource inputs of teacher education, teacher salary, administrative inputs, facilities, and pupil/teacher ratio have significant combined p-values in the negative case for both the full sample and the sample restricted to achievement outcomes. The analysis of the robustness sample shows that data from a single publication is responsible for the negative statistically significant combined effects for all of these variables except facilities (over all outcomes).

These analyses provide persuasive evidence that, with the possible exception of facilities, there is evidence of statistically reliable relations between educational resource

inputs and school outputs and there is much more evidence of positive relations than of negative relations between resource inputs and outputs.

Effect size analyses. The median effect sizes for each of the independent variables is given in Table 3. The median half standardized regression coefficient for PPE computed over all studies is .0014. This coefficient is large enough to be of considerable practical importance. It suggests that an increase of PPE by $500 (approximately 10% of the national average) would be associated with a .7 standard deviation increase in student outcome. By the standards of educational treatment interventions, this would be considered a large effect. The median effect obtained in studies that used academic achievement as the outcome is even larger and the median effects in the various robustness tests are of comparable magnitude--large enough to be practically important.

INSERT TABLE 3

The median effects for teacher experience also are positive in each case, although the measures used for teacher experience make the interpretation of the magnitude more difficult. The median effects for teacher salary are generally positive overall, but their magnitude is too small to be of practical importance except in the case of the conservatively independent sample and the sample with the most influential publication deleted. This might be interpreted to imply that except for the consequences of non-independence and of a single influential publication, these results point to a positive effect of teacher salary.

In contrast, the median effects for teacher education are negative in each of the samples of studies. The median coefficients for teacher/pupil ratio, pupil/teacher ratio, administrative inputs, and facilities show a mixed pattern of sometimes being positive and sometimes negative. Thus the effect size analysis for these coefficients does not show a persuasively consistent pattern.

Taken together, the effect size analyses suggest a pattern of substantially positive effects for global resource inputs (PPE), whereas the effects of the components of overall resource inputs (teacher salary, teacher experience, administrative inputs, and facilities) are typically positive, but not always so. The typical effects of class size (expressed either as pupil/teacher ratio or teacher/pupil ratio) are decidedly mixed and the typical effect of teacher experience is negative.

It might seem odd that the effects of global resource inputs (PPE) are so clearly positive while the effects for the components are less consistently positive. However this is not at all contradictory. This pattern of results is consistent with the idea that resources matter, but allocation of resources to a specific area (such as reducing class size or improving facilities) may not be helpful in all situations. That is, local circumstances may determine which resource inputs are most effective and local authorities utilize discretion in wisely allocating global resources among the areas most in need.

Conclusions

The production function studies of the relation between resource inputs and school outputs examined by Hanushek do not support his conclusion that resource inputs are unrelated to outputs. The analytic method he used to synthesize results across studies has low statistical power and hence his conclusion--accepting the null hypothesis--would seem particularly suspect.

Reanalysis with more powerful analytic methods suggests strong support for at least some positive effects of resource inputs and little support for the existence of negative effects. Effect magnitude analyses suggest that these effects (at least for PPE) are large enough to be of real importance. Moreover these findings seem to be robust against obvious threats to their validity (such as non-independence of data sets, single influential publications, and outliers). While the pattern of effect sizes is most persuasive for global resource variables (PPE and teacher experience), the median effects are positive for most resource variables.

We are not arguing that the studies used by Hanushek are an adequate basis for resolving the question about the magnitude of the relation between resource inputs and school outputs. We have serious reservations about the age of some of the data and the measurement and design of some of the studies. We believe that a synthesis similar to this one should be conducted using a more adequate sample of studies to better answer detailed scientific and policy questions about educational production functions.

Even if the conclusions drawn from these studies are correct, we would not argue that increasing global resource allocations to schools is the most efficient method of increasing educational achievement. It almost surely is not. However the question of whether more resources are needed to produce real improvement in our nations schools can no longer be ignored. Relying on the data most often used to deny that resources are related to achievement, we find that money does matter after all.

Table 1
Summary of the Production Function
Coefficients Utilized in the Analyses

	Significant Postive	Significant Negative	Non-Significant Positive	Non-Significant Negative	Non-Significant Unknown	Total
PPE						
Hanushek	13 (21%)	3 (6%)	25 (46%)	13 (24%)	11(*)	65
Re-analysis	13 (24%)	3 (5%)	25 (45%)	14 (25%)		55
Combined Significance	12 (34%)	3 (9%)	13 (37%)	7 (20%)		35
Effect Size Estimation	10 (26%)	1 (3%)	20 (53%)	7 (18%)		38
Teacher Experience						
Hanushek	40 (32%)	10 (8%)	44 (35%)	31 (25%)	15 (*)	140
Re-analysis	39 (30%)	7 (5%)	52 (39%)	34 (26%)		132
Combined Significance	34 (31%)	7 (6%)	39 (36%)	28 (26%)		108
Effect Size Estimation	15 (26%)	2 (4%)	26 (46%)	14 (25%)		57
Teacher Education						
Hanushek	8 (11%)	5 (7%)	31 (41%)	32 (42%)	37 (*)	113
Re-analysis	10 (11%)	6 (7%)	39 (45%)	32 (37%)		87
Combined Significance	8 (12%)	5 (7%)	35 (52%)	19 (28%)		67
Effect Size Estimation	4 (10%)	3 (7%)	13 (32%)	21 (51%)		41
Teacher Salary						
Hanushek	11 (21%)	4 (9%)	16 (36%)	14 (31%)	24 (*)	69
Re-analysis	9 (21%)	4 (9%)	16 (36%)	14 (33%)		43
Combined Significance	6 (22%)	3 (11%)	11 (41%)	6 (26%)		26
Effect Size Estimation	4 (14%)	3 (11%)	10 (36%)	10 (39%)		27
Teacher/Pupil Ratio						
Hanushek	14 (13%)	13 (12%)	34 (32%)	46 (43%)	45(*)	152
Re-analysis	12 (10%)	15 (13%)	44 (38%)	45 (38%)		116
Combined Significance	10 (11%)	12 (13%)	39 (42%)	31 (34%)		92
Effect Size Estimation	6 (9%)	7 (10%)	21 (30%)	35 (51%)		69
Administrative Inputs						
Hanushek	7 (19%)	1 (3%)	14 (38%)	15 (41%)	24 (*)	61
Re-analysis	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	14 (40%)	14 (40%)		35
Combined Significance	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	11 (41%)	10 (37%)		27
Effect Size Estimation	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	14 (40%)	14 (40%)		35
Facilities						
Hanushek	7 (16%)	5 (12%)	17 (40%)	14 (33%)	31 (*)	74
Re-analysis	7 (9%)	8 (10%)	30 (39%)	32 (42%)		77
Combined Significance	6 (11%)	7 (13%)	20 (36%)	22 (40%)		55
Effect Size Estimation	3 (6%)	4 (9%)	15 (32%)	25 (53%)		47

*Figures for non-significant unknown are not included in the percentages.
Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2
Results of Combined Significance Tests

Input (Outcomes)	Positive Case ($H_0: \beta \leq 0$) Sample				Negative Case ($H_0: \beta \geq 0$) Sample			
	Full	Independent	Middle 90%	Delete 1	Full	Independent	Middle 90%	Delete 1
PPE								
All	R	R	R	R				
Achievement	R	R	R	R				
Teacher Education								
All	R	R	R	R	R			
Achievement	R	R	R	R	R			
Teacher Experience								
All	R	R	R	R				
Achievement	R	R	R	R				
Teacher Salary								
All	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	
Achievement	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	
Pupil/Teacher Ratio*								
All	R	R	R	R	R			
Achievement	R	R	R	R	R			
Teacher/Pupil Ratio								
All	R	R		R				
Achievement	R	R	R	R				
Administrative Inputs								
All	R	R	R	R	R			
Achievement	R	R	R	R	R	R		
Facilities								
All	R	R			R			R
Achievement	R	R	R	R	R			

Note: R implies the null hypothesis is rejected at the $\alpha = 0.5$ level.

*The signs have been reversed to be consistent with teacher pupil ratio so that $\beta > 0$ means that smaller classes have higher outcomes.

Table 3
Median Regression Coefficients

Input	Number of Studies (Publications)	Full	Independent Sample	Middle 90%	Delete 1 Study
PPE[a]					
All	38 (9)	.0014	.0004	.0014	.0014
Achievement	26 (7)	.0020	.0004	.0020	.0013
Teacher Education					
All	41 (7)	-.0200	-.0200	-.0200	-.0200
Achievement	19 (6)	-.0300	-.0200	-.0300	-.0300
Teacher Experience					
All	57 (10)	.0700	.0100	.0700	.0590
Achievement	28 (9)	.0415	.0400	.0455	.0414
Teacher Salary[a]					
All	27 (6)	.000008	.000005	.000008	.000008
Achievement	12 (5)	-.000013	.000366	-.000013	.000390
Pupil/Teacher Ratio					
All	45 (8)	.060	.007	.060	.065
Achievement	22 (7)	.015	-.010	.015	-.015
Teacher/Pupil Ratio					
All	24 (6)	-.001	.009	-.001	-.002
Achievement	16 (9)	.018	.021	.018	.011
Administrative Inputs					
All	35 (6)	.0099	.0042	.0099	.0178
Achievement	35 (6)	-.0169	-.0068	-.0169	.0162
Facilities					
All	47 (7)	-.0100	.0110	-.0100	-.0100
Achievement	22 (7)	.0150	.0111	.0150	.0200

Note: These results are summaries of fully standardized regression coefficients unless otherwise noted.

[a]Half standardized regression coefficients.

Senator SIMON. Dr. Clayborne, I think before you came I mentioned we are limiting our statements to 5 minutes. We will enter your full statement in the record, and we will be happy to hear from you at this point.

Dr. CLAYBORNE. Thank you, Senator.

The East St. Louis School District 189 has an enrollment as of September 28, 1993, of 583 at-risk and early childhood students, 8,106 kindergarten through grade 6 and special education students, 3,030 grade 7 through 9 and special education students, and 2,586 grade 10 through 12 and special education students, and 124 special education students served outside of School District 189. These students are housed in 20 elementary schools, 4 junior high schools, 2 senior high schools, 1 special education school, with grades 5 and 6 at alternative schools, St. Clair County Detention Center, and students in District 189 being served by schools outside of District 189.

The students in this district, as well as all students in the State of Illinois, are entitled to have the same advantages and resources whether they are in a poor or wealthy school district. In the State of Illinois, school funding is based on general State aid, equalized assessed valuation, toll tax rate, operating tax rate, operating expense, per-pupil per-capita tuition charge, and State aid claim type. The State aid claim type operates under three distribution formulas, which are: A, specialized equalization resource equalizer districts; B, referrals to alternative method districts; and, C, referrals to flat grant districts. For fiscal year 1990-91, there were 747 Code A, 130 Code B, and 71 Code C, totaling 948 school districts in Illinois.

School District 189 uses Formula A. This formula does not give equal funding to each school district for they do not cover all students being served by the district. And I have figures to give you to show that.

For example, in 1993, we had 583 students that are in at-risk and early childhood programs that cannot be claimed under general State aid formula A. If you compute this, you will find that the district has lost $12 million plus in the last 4 years.

School District 189 has a declining enrollment. From 1988 through 1989, 722 students and 422 of the 447 nonclaimable students, to a total loss of $5,408,434.40. The loss created a big monster and eventually put District 189 in serious financial conditions.

The decline in the birth rate began in 1983, a flood in 1987-88, and Section 8 houses in surrounding cities and State and Federal categorical funding and mandates which limits the local distribution of funds. And we have tables to present to you showing that loss.

School District 189 is experiencing a declined enrollment due to lack of newborns, new housing, State reforms without adequate funding, an increase in deserved salaries for staff, and Federal mandates and categorical funding.

Where mandates fail to meet the total funding, the district must pick up the funding from nonrestricted sources such as general State aid. And looking at the Chapter 1 proposal for funding disadvantaged students by 1995, I find it is a better look than in the previous year under the name of Chapter 1 to be referred to in

those years as proposed as Title 1. I agree with the proposal that 80 percent of the money will be used on the low-income children. Special education mandates are too strenuous on our district or are inadequately funded, such as District 189 where the budget this year is approximately $8.4 million and only $6.1 million will be generated from local, State, and Federal funds, which means the district must pick up a $2.3 million deficit from nonrestricted funds.

State legislatures were once directly responsible for financing our schools which were in the fund of general State aid apportionment to categorical funding within the State schools' financial plan. I recommend that nonrestricted usage of funds such as general State aid approval will permit wide discretion of usage of funds at the local level. This approach may be implemented in two suggested ways: one, local, State, and Federal sources provide for each school the necessary funds based upon the school's planning, program, and budget system. The PPS will take into account the whole child's needs—educational, economic, social, and health—as it fits the cycle of the child's expected growth and development in the whole community.

No. 2, State and Federal educational agencies should guarantee all districts adequate funds to meet the goals and objectives. If you take a look at statewide averages in Illinois, you will see that more students served, the less moneys are available to educate the students. District 189 has had an outstanding academic program: music, math, science, gifted, high ACT and SAT scores, achievement scores, sports teams, and outstanding students, parents, certified and noncertified staff. However, due to lack of funds and discretionary funding, we will lose these attributes in School District 189.

In closing, I am not sure that equal distribution in funding education is the answer as providing the necessary funds to meet the needs of educating the whole child.

Senator SIMON. I thank you.

I just visited East St. Louis High School before I came here. East St. Louis High School has part of the floor in the gym buckling because of the roof looking. I could go on with the very real physical problems. East St. Louis is typical of many school districts also in that they have imposed a high tax rate in order simply to survive. But as they impose a high tax rate, in fact, people have to leave the city, or, they find they can move elsewhere to pay lower taxes, and then the population goes down, and you get less State aid. I would ask you, Dr. Clayborne, if that is an inaccurate assessment of where you are, and then ask Dr. Tinder and Dr. Hedges if that applies elsewhere and what we do about it.

Dr. CLAYBORNE. The tax rate in School District 189 is the highest tax rate, 7.3 percent, in the State of Illinois. The decline in enrollment as well as the operating expense of the district goes down as the enrollment declines. But you have in East St. Louis alone approximately 4,000 parcels in the county that no moneys are received from because they are county-owned. So as our tax rate goes up and the mobility in the community moves out and the county takes over these parcels, there is no money to receive. In fact, we

only received $4.3 million in taxes even though we have the highest tax rate.

So if you have a decline in enrollment, a decline of tax rate proportions, then the general State aid drops. The local resources drop. The Federal and the State mandates increase, which takes away the local board's ability to use the discretionary funds. And it appears the same way in our district. The smaller districts are taking our population in. They don't have the schools. They are going to have to try to pass tax bond issues to educate those students that are being taken in. And so you have both inequities that are causing the problem.

Senator SIMON. Let me now call on your two colleagues there. You mentioned your special education, and I didn't follow those figures precisely, but they sounded like a relatively high number of special education students. What percentage of your students here in this district are special ed students?

Dr. CLAYBORNE. Presently, we have 14,032 students, and we have 1,268 students being served by special education. Where you have LD, BD, hearing impaired, physically handicapped, you may need one teacher which you are paying around $40,000, plus fringe benefits, and an aide for that one student. So you can see that—and the State only pays $8,000 toward educating that student.

So the figures I mentioned were that in this budget we have $8.4 million that we must budget and must meet the mandates of the State of Illinois; whereas, only $6.1 million is being generated to educate those students. So the district has to pick up the $2.3 million from nonrestricted funds to match the $8.4 million.

Senator SIMON. I might mention the technical title is, as the three of you know, is 94-142. In theory, the Federal Government should be supporting that at about 40 percent. We are supporting it at about 9 percent now in terms of assistance.

Dr. CLAYBORNE. Correct. I think that passed by President Ford in 1975, and that was the downfall of the local school district's control.

Senator SIMON. Well, I happen to support—I think we need that. We need to guarantee education for young people with disabilities, but we also have to provide the resources to local schools to do it.

Dr. CLAYBORNE. Right. Correct.

Senator SIMON. Dr. Tinder and Dr. Hedges, do you have some comments in this area?

Dr. TINDER. Senator, I think your perception of the impact on tax rates and property wealth is essentially accurate. It doesn't really make any difference how high your local property tax rate is if there is nothing to tax. And that is a problem that we face in many of our districts. Property values are declining. You have to raise the tax rate to maintain the status quo.

Another important issue in Illinois is so many districts are largely agricultural, and so if the farm economy is good, then over a period of years perhaps you will do well. But it seems like those trends take a long time to develop, either positively or negatively. Right now in our area we are in the midst of an increase in farmland assessment. It has been going up 3 or 4 percent a year, but that follows 10 years where it went down 5 to 8 percent a year.

So I think you are accurate that when you base everything on property wealth, there will be problems in the long-term.

Senator SIMON. I might add there are about 33 States now that have the kind of suits that you have here in Illinois. I think we have to be looking at other resources.

Dr. Hedges?

Dr. HEDGES. I can only add that the problems we have heard about in this district are paralleled in other districts, and the mathematics of the situation dictates that property taxes are not an adequate basis for funding of schools.

Senator SIMON. I should mention, incidentally, that my colleague, Senator Carol Moseley-Braun had hoped to be here today, but because of some complications in her scheduling, she is not able to.

We face two possibilities for change. One is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that is coming along shortly, and the second, if I may speak candidly to my friend here, is that you are going to have races for Governor here and for the Assembly. And what we have to face up to in both political parties is the need for additional revenue for schools, and we have to move away from the real estate tax base. I don't ordinarily get involved in State issues because I have my plate full at the Federal level. But this is one where clearly the State of Illinois has to do a better job, and we have to have candidates who are willing to stand up to do a better job.

In terms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that we are going to be passing or reauthorizing before too long, are there ways that the Federal Government can, either through a carrot or stick, say to State governments you have to do better? Any suggestions from any of the three of you?

Dr. TINDER. Senator, I have heard it proposed that the Federal Government might consider withholding all Federal funding until schools provide equal opportunities for children. I think that is fairly drastic, but very honestly we are in a drastic position. I am not necessarily advocating that, but I know it is being discussed.

Senator SIMON. Dr. Clayborne?

Dr. CLAYBORNE. My understanding in portions of the proposal is that you are for equity in education in reading the article, and I think that is a good point. However, I think that the mandates and the categorical situation of the funding is too strenuous on districts that are receiving inadequate funds from the beginning. So my suggestion would be turn the mandates into standards to match the local level, maybe through where you are doing—the students are going to college, send the money directly to them and hold them to their standards that they plan.

Senator SIMON. Dr. Hedges?

Dr. HEDGES. It may be that in this circumstance it is important to hold the line on standards and to, if necessary, create a bit of a crisis in order to cause serious consideration in the States of how they can help to meet their financial obligations to educate the children. And extreme remedies such as withholding all Federal funding may be rather extreme, but it may be time to take a look at issues like that or possibilities like that.

Senator SIMON. The State of Michigan, as the three of you know, said it is going to move away from real estate taxes. Now, they un-

fortunately didn't say what they were going to substitute for it, and that is extreme action. But you are also advocating—you are a little more tentative on this, Dr. Hedges, but Dr. Clayborne and Dr. Tinder really are advocating fairly drastic action to force some action.

Is there anything less severe that you would advocate? You talked about the categorical, but other than that, is there—I suppose we could go to saying States that don't follow through on this could lose 50 percent of their funding or something. That would be another alternative.

Any other creative ideas any one of the three of you has in this area?

Dr. TINDER. I think perhaps, as I mentioned in my remarks, if there were a national policy that education was a fundamental right of every citizen, we could get over a big hurdle that we are facing in our suit right now, is the fact that education is a fundamental right. And I think if nothing more than the Federal Government setting that tone for the States, I think that would help a lot.

Senator SIMON. Any other comment?

Dr. CLAYBORNE. To tailgate on that, I think that in the proposal in Chapter 1, as proposed for, I guess, coming into being in fiscal year 1995, there is a movement toward low-income students be served first, not only educationally but also provide health care for each one of those students who cannot provide health care.

My suggestion in that area is that this will allow less funds at the secondary level and more concentration of funds at the preschool and elementary level. And I think that if the funds are allocated based upon low-income, the early intervention programs receive the bulk of the funds.

Senator SIMON. And early intervention is clearly something that we have to have. I can't help but think of—and I am not presuming innocence or guilt—the two young men who are charged with killing Michael Jordan's father. Both happened to go to the same schools, one white, one black. They are both school dropouts. What if when they were in the second grade or first grade or even in the preschool period we had determined they were heading for some difficulties, and you knew before they were in high school that they had difficulties? You know, a 3rd grade teacher could have told you those two boys were having problems. What if we were doing more in that area, in that period? No question that is part of what we have to do.

I thank all three of you. Let me just add, in the House they are moving probably late this year on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We will be moving early next year. It is not going to get all the headlines that health care and a lot of other things that we are doing will receive, but we are eager for the contribution that any of you has in this field. We thank you very, very much for your testimony here today.

Senator SIMON. Our next panel: Greg Jung, who is a 5th grade teacher at Kratz Elementary School; and Annie Watkins, a biology teacher at East St. Louis Senior High School; Don Baden, professor, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, and associate dean at the School of Education at SIU; and Dr. Fred Hess, who

has testified before, the executive director of the Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance.

Let me also acknowledge the presence of Doris Brents of our staff, who has been working on this. Doris, stand up and take a bow back there. We thank you for your work also.

We will take you in the order that you are seated there unless you have any preference. Greg Jung, we will hear from you first. If you can move that microphone along so that the others here can hear the testimony.

STATEMENTS OF GREG JUNG, TEACHER, KRATZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; DR. G. ALFRED HESS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHICAGO PANEL ON PUBLIC SCHOOL POLICY AND FINANCE; ANNE WATKINS, TEACHER, EAST ST. LOUIS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL; DON BADEN, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, AND ASSOCIATE DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, SIU.

Mr. JUNG. Thank you, Senator Simon, for inviting me to present my experiences and to express my opinions on this topic.

By way of introduction, I am an elementary school teacher and have been for the past 21 years. My first 14 years were spent teaching 6th grade in the Vandalia, MO, school system. Vandalia is a small town, approximately 3,600 people.

Senator SIMON. Where was this, again?

Mr. JUNG. Vandalia, MO.

Senator SIMON. Vandalia. All right.

Mr. JUNG. In 1987, I accepted a teaching job in the Rittner school district in St. Louis County. I taught 4th grade for about 5 of those years, and presently I am in my second year of teaching 5th grade.

During my career, I have faced many ups and downs, and perhaps the most frustrating thing to deal with has been the constant criticism our schools and education employees have received. They have been attacked from all sides and blamed for every ill that has befallen our society. Teachers know that we don't educate students in a vacuum, free from outside influences and variables. We get students who are hungry, students with emotional problems, students who aren't motivated to learn. We deal with parents who lack parenting skills, and on top of all these outside influences, teachers have been told to do this job without adequate resources.

The old African proverb says it takes a whole village to educate a child. I would suggest to you that it takes our whole country to educate our children. Teachers can't do this job alone. We realize this fact, and we are working with people and groups of people to help solve some of the problems that our children face. We are working to improve our teaching methods and to offer parents training in the skills that they need to raise healthy, motivated children. Now we need more help from the Government.

Through the majority of my career, critics of public education have been saying that the Government has been pouring too much money into our education system or that throwing money at the problem isn't the answer. How do they know? Compared to other categories, public education has received crumbs.

The Government has poured money into our defense system, but not education. Quality education is the backbone of our defense.

The Government funnels money into new prisons, but not education. Education is the best investment in making productive citizens.

Who can say that more money isn't going to help? We haven't tried it. Especially since 1980, schools have not received the support they so desperately need from the Government. As a teacher in Vandalia, MO, I could see many places where more money was definitely needed. We had to decide which of our students were in the greatest need because there wasn't enough money to fully implement Chapter 1 programs. Teachers as a whole were paid very, very poorly. Very few, if any, professional development activities were provided, and those that were didn't really meet the needs of our staff.

Teachers often had to purchase many of their own supplies because the district couldn't budget money for everything that was needed. It was difficult to attract high-quality new teachers. Many of those we were able to attract left after only a year or two in the system because of the poor salary and the working conditions. I felt like the school district was a teacher training institution instead of an adequately funded quality school system.

After 14 years, I decided that I needed to move on. I started to look for a job in a metropolitan school district that had more money. Even though I knew that that was the best thing for me, I felt that I was giving up on the children in that community. They were stuck in a system that was sorely underfunded. Even though the educators did the very best with the resources they were provided, the students weren't receiving the equitable education compared to other students across the State.

When I accepted the job at Rittner, I was placed at the fifth step on our salary schedule even though I had 14 years of experience. However, that still gave me a raise of approximately $4,000. You need to understand that Rittner is not a wealthy district. It uses its money wisely, and it understands the importance of high-quality teaching staff, and the result is a salary schedule that is competitive with other area schools. It also understands that teachers are, indeed, professionals and, as such, are in control of their staff development.

So is the situation ideal now? Well, not by a long shot. Many of our elementary classes have 30 or more in them. There are no teacher aides. Teachers still find it necessary to purchase some of their supplies. Finding enough money is still a problem. Students in 4th and 5th grade classes in our school district don't receive regular Chapter 1 assistance during the school day. Instead, we have an after-school program that we give some help to. I have 28 students in my 5th grade class; 14 of them quality for Chapter 1 assistance. And if I am very lucky, I may be able to get after-school assistance for two or three of those.

We need assistance in fully funding parent outreach programs. Such programs provide parenting skills training and help parents become their child's first teacher.

Rittner is working hard to continually improve our schools. Almost all of the school improvement work has to be done in addition to our full teaching load. We could use funding from the Federal

Government to help us improve in this area. Give us the resources to help explore ways to improve the job that we do.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my belief that the Federal Government can and should make a greater financial commitment to public education. This can be accomplished and still maintain local control of schools. We can't succeed in isolation. It takes a whole village to educate a child.

Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jung follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREG JUNG

As a preface to my testimony I would like to thank Senator Simon and the Committee for giving me the opportunity to present my experiences and express my opinions. Having worked closely with hundreds of educators across the state of Missouri and thousands across our country, I believe that the comments that follow are not the feelings of a sole teacher, but instead are representative of teachers all over the United States.

By way of introduction, I am an elementary teacher and have been for the past 21 years. The first 14 years of my career were spent teaching sixth grade in Vandalia, Missouri, population 3,600. In 1987 I accepted a teaching job in the Ritenour School District of St. Louis County. I taught fourth grade for the first five years, and I am presently in my second year of teaching fifth grade students. I enjoy my work and am very proud to be a teacher.

During my career I have faced many ups and downs. Perhaps the most frustrating thing to deal with has been the constant criticism of our schools and the education employees. We have been attacked from all sides and blamed for every ill that has befallen our society. Teachers know that we do not educate students in a vacuum, free from all outside influences and variables. We get students who are hungry, students with emotional problems, students who aren't motivated to learn. We deal with parents who lack parenting skills. And on top of all of these outside influences, teachers have been told to do the job without adequate resources.

The old African proverb says, "It takes the whole village to educate a child." I would suggest to you that it takes the whole country to educate our children. Teachers cannot do the job alone. We realize this fact and are working with other people

and groups to help solve some of the problems our children face. We are working to improve teaching methods and to offer parents training in the skills needed to raise healthy, motivated children. Now we need more help from the government.

For the majority of my career, critics of public education have been saying that the government has been pouring too much money into our education system, or that throwing money at the problem is not the answer. How do they know! Compared to other categories, public education has received crumbs. The government has poured money into our defense system, but not education. Quality education is the backbone of our defense. The government funnels money into new prisons, but not education. Education is the best investment in making productive citizens. Who can say that more money isn't going to help? We haven't tried it.

Especially since 1980 schools have not received the support they so desperately need from the government. As a teacher in Vandalia, MO, I could see many places where more money was definitely needed. We had to decide which of our students were in the greatest need because there wasn't enough money to fully implement Chapter I programs. Teachers, as a whole, were paid very poorly. Very few, if any, professional development activities were provided. Those that were provided did not meet the needs of the staff.

Teachers often purchased many of their own supplies because the district couldn't budget money for everything we needed. It was difficult to attract high quality, new teachers. Many of those we were able to attract left after only a year or two because of the poor salary and working conditions. I felt like the school district was a teacher training institution instead of an adequately funded, quality school system.

After 14 years I couldn't take it any more. I knew that I was starting to burn out so I started looking for a job in a metropolitan district that had more money. Even though I knew this was the best thing for me, I felt as though I was giving up on the children in that community. They were stuck in a system that was sorely underfunded. Even though the educators did the very best with the resources they were provided, the students were not receiving an equitable education compared to other students across the state.

When I accepted the job at Ritenour I was placed at the fifth step on the salary schedule even though I had 14 years of experience. However, this still provided me with a salary increase of approximately $4000. You need to understand that Ritenour is not a wealthy district. It uses it's money wisely. It understands the importance of a high quality teaching staff and as a result the salary schedule is competitive with area schools. It also understands that teachers are professionals and as such they are in control of their own staff development.

So, is this the ideal situation? Not by a long shot. Many elementary class sizes are 30 and higher. There are no teacher aides. Teachers still find it necessary to purchase some of their supplies. Finding enough money is still a problem Students in fourth and fifth grade are not provided Chapter I assistance during the school day. Instead they are part of an after school program that still does not have the resources to help everyone that qualifies. Out of my class of 28 fifth graders, 14 qualify for Chapter I. From this number I may be able to get help for 2 or 3.

We need assistance in fully funding parent outreach programs. Such programs provide parenting skills training and help parents become their child's first teacher. Ritenour is working hard to continually improve our schools. Almost all of this school

improvement work has to be done in addition to a full teaching load. We could use funding to help us improve. Give us the resources to explore ways to improve the job we do.

In closing I would like to reiterate my belief that the federal government can, and should, make a greater financial commitment to the public schools. This can be accomplished and still maintain local control of our schools. We cannot succeed in isolation. "It takes a whole village to educate a child."

Senator SIMON. Fred Hess, we welcome you. Usually you are testifying in Washington rather than East St. Louis, but we welcome you here.

Dr. HESS. Thank you, Senator. As you mentioned, I am the executive director of the Chicago Panel on School Policy, but I am appearing this morning as the president of a statewide coalition of which the panel is a part, the Coalition on Educational Rights. Our coalition includes the professional labor organizations across the State, the Farm Bureau, and civic organizations like my own and the Chicago Urban League and the State League of Women Voters, and we are working to reform the way in which financing of schools in Illinois is carried on.

We want to salute you for deciding to have these hearings here in East St. Louis, and I am delighted that you have had witnesses from the school system here talking about their problems. One of the things that Mr. Clayborne didn't say was that with that highest in the State tax rate that East St. Louis imposes upon its property owners, they are able to raise a grand total of $352 for each child that comes to school in this system. There simply is not the ability to raise local funds to do the job in this city, and so we salute you for having these hearings here.

In our testimony, we go on to look at the problems of finance inequity across the State of Illinois and to look at the problems of taxpayer inequity which are also at work, because not only do you have some taxpayers paying huge tax rates such as here in East St. Louis, but you have others paying less than $1 on $100 worth of equalized assessed valuation and able to receive education in which they have a teacher for every 9 children as against a teacher for every 30 children, as Mr. Jung has just been talking about.

So there is a tremendous problem across the State. We are delighted that you are willing to address it. I would like to try and answer the questions that you were raising. Is there something that can be done about it, and what are the things that can be done about it?

One of the nice things is that we just did win in a suit in Missouri, and I was privileged to be an expert witness in that suit on behalf of the St. Louis public schools. And we are delighted to see a more equitable system of funding schools coming into place in Missouri.

In Illinois, we are not so fortunate, as Dr. Tinder mentioned, and our coalition is supporting the committee's work in suing the State. We are before the appeals court now because the attorney general of this State, who is one of those candidates for Governor whom you mentioned, has decided to go to court and tell the court that the children of Illinois do not have a fundamental right to an education in this State. That is his defense. He has simply dismissed the rights of children in this State to equal treatment. His argument basically is that the State of Illinois can treat children as unequally as it chooses to do so, and it is choosing to do so very, very unequally at our current moment. So we are in a very tough bind.

Can the Federal Government help in this process? We think it can. There are three strategies that are available to you as the Federal Government as you look forward to this problem. Over the last 30 years, we have been moving toward the development of a

national educational policy. Prior to that time, education was seen to be strictly a State and local policy. We are now moving toward development of a national educational policy, and I think forwarding that movement is one strategy. A second strategy is the one you mentioned earlier, carrots and sticks, incentives and sanctions, and I have some comments to make about that. Then the third strategy is the one that Dr. Tinder also mentioned in his impromptu comments in response to your questions, and that is a strategy in which somewhere in the reauthorization language or in the Goals 2000 language that is before the Congress now, we insert the fact that it is a fundamental interest of the Nation that every child have an adequate education. So those are the three basic strategies that I would like to put before you.

In terms of developing a national policy, we are moving in that direction now. It has been a bipartisan movement through now 30 years of Presidential administrations of both Republicans and Democrats, starting with the Eisenhower support for math and science education in response to the Sputnik movement, and going through the War on Poverty efforts of President Johnson. We are now moving to the point of establishing goals and objectives for student learning, and thankfully, this administration has included in their program some concern about equality of learning opportunities.

It seems to me that latter part gives us a real opportunity at the Federal Government level to insist that the Federal Government work to provide those equal opportunities. Professor Klune, I understand, is also submitting written testimony to this hearing, from the University of Wisconsin, and some of his colleagues have suggested that we maybe ought to take a whole different way of funding schools in the United States, that we ought to move off the effort of funding school districts that have unequal resources and try to equalize those resources, and instead focus our funding on the needs of students. That simply shift of making the student and his or her needs the center of funding, rather than school districts the center of funding, would be a major change.

One of the ways that Professor Klune has suggested to do that is that he estimates it would cost about $10,000 per student to adequately educate disadvantaged students. In the north suburbs of Chicago, school districts already provide $10,000 per student. Those are the students, however, who are not economically disadvantaged and don't need that kind of extra assistance. The students in East St. Louis and Chicago and other school districts who need that don't have those kinds of funds available.

So one proposal might be to take the Chapter 1 reauthorization, use your increasing 1 percent a year funding mechanism. If we could get to $170 billion nationally, put in through Federal Chapter 1, we could get to the $5,000-a-year support level that Professor Klune thinks would be needed from the Federal Government, and that would be one way of equalizing. It would be equalizing by allowing the Federal Government to assume the predominant role in funding of schools across the Nation.

That would be a dramatic and radical effort. The Federal Government hasn't shown that kind of willingness to be dramatic and radical, and with the kind of budget deficits that we are facing, it

is not likely that we are going to do that right away. But I think it is certainly one of the strategies that we should explore, that we are moving in that direction as we adopt objectives and student achievement goals, and that we need to then keep in mind and in line with that the need for equality of opportunity.

The second mechanism is the mechanism of sticks and carrots, of sanctions and incentives. I would like to just highlight one problem with the sanctions piece. My good colleague, Randy Tinder, has referred to maybe real sanctions that would cut off all kinds of Federal moneys.

We have got increasing sophistication about the use of sanctions over the last decade-and-a-half. Prior to that, through work of people like Congressman Augustus Hawkins, the sanctions were basically sanctions that said we will take away the Federal money. The problem is, when you take away the Federal money, you are taking it away from the kids who need the help, rather than sanctioning the adults who are screwing the system up. So instead of sanctioning the adults, we are sanctioning the kids. That is the wrong way to go, it seems to me.

More recently, we have found better ways of doing it. In New Jersey, they have an educational bankruptcy law. In that case, it is not the kids who get sanctioned. It is the school board members, it is the political patrons, and it is the principals and teachers who are sanctioned if the school system screws up. They lose the ability to grant contracts and jobs and so forth. The kids get a new kind of governance that focuses on making those school systems work for them. In Chicago, in the School Reform Act in Chicago, we have done the same thing. It is principals, local school councils, and teachers who are first sanctioned if a school isn't improving. The children are not the ones who lose out.

Kentucky has taken that one step further and said if the school system screws up, then the kids ought to have the right to go to any other school that is doing better than the schools that they have when we get to that point.

I think the sanctions have to focus on adults, not kids. They have to take away power from adults, not services from kids. We have recently seen the effectiveness of that here in Illinois. The EPA last week threatened the State of Illinois with the loss of $700 million in highway funds if we don't do a better job of reducing the auto commuting, emissions from autos in terms of auto commuting. That got a lot of attention, and a lot of the political leaders were concerned because it is their friends who get the contracts for the highway jobs that the Federal dollars provide.

Sanctions that focus on adults I think are the ones we want, not the sanctions that focus on taking services away from kids.

Finally, let me just reiterate Dr. Tinder's question: Let's put into the Federal legislation on goals and opportunities to learn the fact that the Federal Government sees education as in its fundamental interest; that every child having an equal opportunity to learn the things that we think children should know and be able to do is a critical component of that legislation. Let's just put it in there. Let's make it clear the Federal Government considers education now to be a fundamental interest for the Nation and, therefore, a fundamental right for the children. If we do that, we will then lay

the groundwork for undoing the kind of work that the attorney general of this State is perpetuating in his defense of the lawsuit.

There are better ways of funding schools across States and across the Nation. If the Federal Government will be bold in taking some of these strategies, I think we can move forward in this area, and those of us at the State level can then find ways to make sure that children of Lansdowne Junior High School have the ability to have computers in every classroom, not just in a couple, have adequate science labs and get a chance to learn what they ought to be learning.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator SIMON. Thank you. You have a friend or a relative in the audience. [Laughter.]

Let me just make an assignment to you and to Dr. Tinder. I would like to ask the two of you to prepare language on that fundamental right.

Dr. HESS. We would be delighted to.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Hess follows:]

Prepared Statement of G. Alfred Hess, Jr.

Good morning. Senator Simon and Senator Mosley-Braun. I am Fred Hess, president of the Coalition for Educational Rights and am accompanied by Richard Laine, the Coalition's Executive Director. The Coalition is the only multi-faceted, state-wide voice for organizations and individuals who are dedicated to achieving fair funding for all public school children throughout Illinois. Its membership includes state-wide civic and labor organizations, the Illinois Farm Bureau, local educational advocacy organizations like the Chicago Urban League and my own organization, the Chicago Panel on School Policy, and a wide range of individuals, including business leaders, professionals, civic activists, and educational advocates.

The Coalition's goal is to reform the current education funding system in Illinois so that it provides adequate, equitable, and predictable funding for all public school children in the state. We appear before you today to ask for the assistance of the federal government in accomplishing our goal. We know both of you share the same personal commitment to a similar goal for the children of our great state and for the entire nation. Therefore, our testimony is not an attempt to convince you of the need or of the rightness of our cause. Rather, we will try to explore with you some ways the federal government might assist in reaching our shared goal.

The Problem

Still, it is necessary to remind ourselves of how dire the current situation is in Illinois. We commend you, Senator Simon, for scheduling this hearing in East St. Louis, one of the places in our state most desperately in need. The affluent in Illinois like to claim that the only reason any child is denied an adequate education is because their taxpayers are not willing to pay high taxes to support their own children. The taxpayers of East St. Louis give the lie to that proposition. To live in East St. Louis is to pay the highest public school tax rate in Illinois, $7.56 per $100 of Equalized Assessed Value (EAV). But property values are so low in this city, that even with that record breaking effort, the local school district can only raise $352 per pupil from local sources. Even with state assistance, the school district can only provide a basic education worth $3,028 per pupil.[2] The Illinois General Assembly's own Task Force on School Finance set the cost of an adequate basic education in Illinois in 1991 at $3,898 per pupil. Thus, the 13,509 students of East St. Louis are part of the 80 percent of all students in Illinois who do not receive enough support to benefit from what the state, itself, has determined is an adequate education.

This deplorable situation is not because the people of East St. Louis and others like them are not willing to pay their fair share of the cost of an adequate education for their children. It is because other, more affluent, taxpayers are not willing to pay their share of the costs of education for all of the children of this state. In 1991, Illinois ranked 11th in the nation in per capita personal income; on average, each man, woman, and child in Illinois had $20,731 of income.[3] Meanwhile, we rank 48th in taxes for public schools per $1,000 of personal income. In fact, Illinois has a low tax burden compared to other states. Per $1,000 of income, Illinoisans pay only $102.87 in all local and state taxes, compared to a national average of $109.10. We also pay less than other states like us: the average tax burden in the midwest is $108.93 per $1,000 of income, and the burden in the more industrialized states averages $108.64. Thus, on average, we do not contribute much of our income to support state and local governmental activity, and we are particularly penurious in support of our public schools.

But, as the people of East St. Louis demonstrate, not all of us are average. Some of our citizens have far less than the average per capita income, and too frequently these same persons are asked to bear a higher than average share of the costs of schools and other governmental services. This is fundamentally unfair!

As the Citizens for Tax Justice[4] has shown, Illinois is particularly bad in asking our poorest citizens to bear a disproportionate share of the costs of schools and other government services, while allowing our most affluent citizens a nearly free ride! Families in the bottom twenty percent of the income distribution paid 16.5 percent of their meager income in state and local taxes, while those in the top one percent, after discounting for write-offs on federal taxes (a benefit not available to the poorest citizens), paid only 4.9 percent of their income in state and local taxes! In Illinois, our poorest citizens pay more than three times the share of their income in taxes as do our richest families; nationally, the pattern is for the poorest to pay just over twice the share of their income in taxes. However, in some states, such as our neighbor Minnesota, the tax burden falls equally on all income brackets. Thus, it is not surprising that Illinois qualifies as one of the "terrible ten" states in the Citizens for Tax Justice list of states noted for the regressive nature of their tax systems.

Directly related to this unfairness in taxation is the resulting unfairness in school funding. When Wayne Riddle and Liane White examined per pupil spending across the nation for the Congressional Research Service, they found that Illinois had the worst disparity in the nation at both the high school and elementary school level! When examining just high school districts, schools at the 95th percentile had two and a half times more to spend on each pupil than did schools in districts at the 5th percentile. Among elementary districts, the richer schools had 2.3 times as much to spend as did the poorer schools. These figures are similar to those we developed in our study of *The Inequity in Illinois School Finance*.[5] Because Illinois allows three different types of school districts to exist (elementary, high school, and unit), and because the unit districts primarily serve poorer cities and rural areas while the dual district structure exists primarily in the more affluent suburban areas, we hide the wide gaps that exist between our richer suburban districts, at least 36 of which spend more than $10,000 per pupil, and the poorer, city and rural districts, 36 of which do not even provide the state minimum foundation level of support of $2,600 per pupil!

The common connection between the unfair tax burden imposed upon our poorest citizens and the unfair educational opportunities afforded children in our poorest school districts is the over-reliance on the property tax in Illinois. The double unfairness is that the parents of the under supported students are frequently the same persons bearing an unfair portion of the state's tax system. Per $1,000 of income, Illinoisans pay $37.89 in property taxes, compared to a national average of $34.88, a midwest average of $34.43, and an industrial states average of $36.93. Because property wealth is so unevenly distributed across the state, some families pay virtually nothing to support their schools handsomely, while others pay through the nose for meager services. Taxpayers in Niles (a suburb just north of Chicago) pay less than a dollar per $100 EAV for their local elementary schools, which have a teacher for every nine students, while those in South suburban Park Forest pay over seven dollars for schools that have a teacher for every 23 children!

Are Solutions Possible?

The people of Illinois might be excused for perpetrating such an unfair system of taxation and education funding on the less affluent if there were no alternatives available to them. In fact, there are many states, such as Minnesota, which have much more equitable taxation policies and which provide more adequate and equitable funding for their public schools. Riddle and White note that both the District of Columbia and Hawaii have single school districts, which eliminates the interdistrict disparities common in other states (they did not examine the disparities between schools within those two jurisdictions, a problem the Chicago Panel has found to be quite significant within single, large urban school districts). Other states like Iowa, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and Alabama also show little variation in spending from district to district (though in Alabama, the level of funding was so low that a court ruled it was in violation of the state constitution earlier this year).

Today we sit just across the river from another state which historically was about as bad as Illinois. However, last January, Judge Byron L. Kinder ruled that the Missouri school finance system was unconstitutional,[6] and the state legislature subsequently enacted a new school finance system which largely disconnects school funding from differences in property wealth. Across another river sits the state of Kentucky which has embarked upon a grand crusade, not just to achieve equitable and adequate funding for schools across the Bluegrass state, but to dramatically improve the quality of education offered to all of its students. It is not necessary for states like Illinois to treat their poorest taxpayers and their poorest children so shabbily.

Could Illinois afford to fix its current system? Absolutely! The Coalition for Educational Rights has adopted a set of principles for finding such a solution:

> 1) The quality of a child's education should not be dependent on the wealth of the locality in which he or she was born or lives, but on the wealth of the entire state.
>
> 2) Every child should have access to at least an adequate educational program. Any adequacy model should reflect the exponentially increasing educational needs of children in schools with high concentrations of low-income students.
>
> 3) Public education should be funded from multiple tax bases, with the majority of the funds....to be provided through state-wide taxes.
>
> 4) The Coalition supports reform to the state tax codes which improve their progressivity and fairness.
>
> 5) The Coalition strongly believes that equity should not be achieved at the expense of adequacy, but that a fair education funding system must be both adequate and equitable.
>
> 6) In order to encourage the increase in the educational effectiveness of public schools, the Coalition supports accountability in education.

However, the Illinois General Assembly's Task Force on School Finance avoided the hard questions addressed by the Missouri legislature, questions that would require a whole new system of school finance. Instead, they fashioned a solution that would simply require higher state support for its public schools and provide a small measure of property tax relief. The estimated cost of the task force solution was $1.5 billion, phased in over five years. When Erik Olson, writing for *Intergovernmental Issues* in January of 1993, assessed the effect of raising those funds through an increase in the state's flat rate income tax, he noted that the individual rate would have to rise from 3.0 percent of adjusted gross income to 3.83 percent. Such an increase would have the effect of raising Illinois from 42nd place in income taxes as a percent of personal income to 40th place. Thus, Illinois easily has the economic capacity to address the gross inequity it visits upon its citizens. What it lacks is the political capacity to achieve fairness.

A Potential Role for the Federal Government

There are at least three different strategies the federal government might adopt to assure equity and adequacy in the funding of public schools across our nation. The first is politically and legally difficult, but there is gathering support for adopting a national educational policy, one component of which might be assuring equitable and adequate funding for all American school children. A second strategy is the more traditional federal approach in education of creating incentives and sanctions: incentives towards more equitable funding within states and sanctions for those which fall short. Illinois would certainly qualify as a prime target under such a scenario. The third strategy is to lay the legal groundwork at the federal level to guarantee to every American school child the equal protection of the laws in seeking equitable and adequate funding for the public schools they attend. These strategies overlap and are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Rather, they might work together and reinforce each other.

A National Educational Policy

Over the past three decades, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, a national educational policy has been developing. Given impetus by the launching of sputnik, in the late 1950s, national leaders have realized there are national interests, not just local and state interests, in the quality of education provided by America's public schools. Initial forays into the development of a national educational policy took the form of support for the improvement of math and science (the Eisenhower program) and enrichment for the economically disadvantaged (a part of Johnson's War on Poverty). Later efforts focused on assuring appropriate educational opportunities for those with special handicaps or with limited proficiency in English. Under the Reagan and Bush administrations, the focus broadened to include a general concern about the low levels of achievement of public school students nationwide.

This concern led to a remarkably bi-partisan effort to develop a set of national goals for education, adopted by the nation's governors in 1989. A National Goals Panel was established. Only last week, the Panel released its third annual report, indicating how far we still have to go to reach the goals established with a year 2000 target date. Education Secretary Richard Riley, in commenting upon the report, showed the shift in national policy that is now emerging. He said, "For the last 25 years the federal government has supported piecemeal efforts through narrow, categorical programs to address educational problems in America....The federal government must be a leader in supporting a system-wide restructuring."[7]

Currently, federal officials are proclaiming that the development of a "national" educational policy does not necessarily mean direct "federal" control of public education. Current legislative initiatives by the Department of Education, which clearly build upon the efforts of both the Reagan and Bush administrations and thus represent a growing bi-partisan movement, despite the partisan carping about specific elements in the initiatives, would establish the national goals in federal law and would establish a set of achievement objectives for students nationwide. While many felt the goals were not very realistic, they do make evident the current shortcomings of our nation's schools, even those in affluent suburbs considered to be our most successful. Included in the department's initiatives are provisions to assure that every student has an opportunity to learn that would be adequate to prepare him or her to meet the national achievement objectives.

At the same time, the Department of Education has submitted its initiative for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A National Commission on Chapter 1 has proposed sweeping changes in the way in which federal support for economically disadvantaged students is provided. While school-based reform advocates, including many Chicagoans, worry about the federal propensity to rely overly much on state governments, which we have found to be largely unsympathetic to the problems of transforming urban schools, the general directions of the Commission's report are encouraging. One of its primary findings was that the intended compensatory effect of Chapter 1 funds has been seriously compromised by the huge disparities in basic funding in many states like Illinois. The Goals 2000 and federal Chapter 1 reauthorization provide an opportunity for those seeking to assure equity and adequacy in the support for public schools across the nation.

A number of scholars and policy advocates, most notably Professor William Clune (University of Wisconsin, Madison) and his colleagues, have proposed the development of an entirely new system of funding schools which is not predicated upon equalizing unequal access to resources, but is focused upon meeting the needs of students if they are to perform at the desired high levels of achievement. The relatively simple sounding shift in focus, from funding school districts to funding student needs, could have far reaching implications and could provide the rationale for a greatly expanded federal role in assuring equity and adequacy.

One proposal Clune has made is that assuring the opportunity to learn for many needy students might cost as much as $10,000 per pupil. (We have already noted that Illinois' most affluent school districts, those with few economically disadvantaged students enrolled, already spend more than this amount on their students.) Since current local and state resources in most districts provide only about half that amount, one way to assure adequate funding for the nation's most needy pupils would be to massively increase the funding of federal Chapter 1 programs while more carefully targeting them towards the most needy students. Currently, federal Chapter 1 funds provide only a fraction of that level of support and are widely dispersed, so that some even reaches these most affluent school districts.[8] If the nation truly wants to assure that all students have an adequate opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to meet the achievement objectives implicit in Goals 2000, such a bold venture would be appropriate.

However, the federal government has not been known for such boldness for the past three decades. Indeed, Department of Education officials, acknowledging the current political atmosphere and the distrust of the federal government in general,[9] have gone to great lengths to portray their current initiatives as a coordinating of voluntary state actions rather than as a federal assumption of the responsibility for educating the nation's young people. Such timidity leads many to prefer the second strategy, incentives and sanctions.

Federal Incentives and Sanctions to Encourage Equity and Adequacy

Incentives and Sanctions are the more traditional approach for the federal government to encourage states to adopt specific educational policies. The federal government has provided funds to encourage states and school districts to undertake desired programs or services. Frequently, the federal government has attached strings to the funds it has provided. Not infrequently, these sanctions have operated to punish the targeted children for the improprieties of the adults charged to implement the federal initiatives. The most common sanction was the withholding of federal funds or the forced repayment of already granted funds.

Congressman Augustus Hawkins was a long-time champion of federal support for disadvantaged public school students. Not surprisingly, Congressman Hawkins was also the sponsor of proposed legislation to seek to force states to move towards greater equity in school funding. Unfortunately, the Hawkins act would have utilized the same type of sanctions that would punish the disadvantaged students of a state (by withholding federal Chapter 1 funds) if the leaders of that state would not move to fix the state's current inequities.

The primary problem with such an approach is that the leaders who perpetuate the inequitable distribution of school funding have already, thereby, demonstrated their lack of concern for the disadvantaged students the federal government would be seeking to assist. The State of Illinois receives just under $300 million in federal Chapter 1 support annually. As I have already indicated, the minimal cost for redressing the current school funding inequity in Illinois is $1.5 billion. The current $300 million federal contribution to the schooling of poor kids is not enough leverage to force the raising of an additional $1.5 billion in state revenue, funds that would have to come in large part from parents of more affluent children or adults without any children in school. To put it simply, state leaders in Illinois would be more likely to tell the federal government to "take their $300 million and shove it" rather than tell their middle class taxpayers to pony up more revenues! The children of these state leaders and the children of the constituents who elected them to office are not the primary beneficiaries of the federal funds, and the loss of those funds would not seriously impact the quality of education offered in most of the school districts served by those leaders.

Thus, a federal approach that relies heavily upon sanctions built on the current federal dollars provided for public schools is likely to be counter-productive. Fortunately, over the last decade, educational policy makers have become more sophisticated in the sanctions they have proposed. In New Jersey, it was not the students who were

disadvantaged by the state educational bankruptcy laws passed during the 1980s. In Jersey City and Patterson, it was members of the Board of Education, political *patrones*, and high level school district bureaucrats who lost their jobs and their abilities to dispense patronage and favored contracts. Similarly, when Chicago activists were writing the Chicago School Reform Act, the bankruptcy provisions for non-performing schools were focused first upon changing the principals, teachers, and Local School Council members. A similar approach in Kentucky added the elimination of mandatory attendance boundaries which would allow students to opt out of non-performing schools to attend others which were more successful.

Effective federal sanctions to encourage more equity in school funding must be focused on the political leaders responsible for maintaining the current inequity rather than upon the students who currently benefit from federal assistance. Recently, we have seen an example of the threat of federal sanctions which did have an impact upon the political leadership of the state. The Environmental Protection Agency has threatened to withhold $700 million in highway funds if Illinois does not move more vigorously to reduce pollutants produced by an over-reliance on automotive commuting. Because these funds support contracts given to contributors to the campaigns of these same political leaders and because these funds provide amenities highly prized by constituents who elect these same political leaders, the threatened withdrawal of funds has been front page news, featuring screams of anguish from the state's leaders. Would that similar threats could be used to force action on school funding inequities, which these same leaders recognize, but only bemoan, mostly with crocodile tears.

The other approach, under this strategy, would be to significantly enrich the incentives: to offer a much bigger carrot. One way to do that would be to increase Chapter I support to the $5,000 level implicit in the Clune proposal. There are undoubtedly other ways to increase the size of the carrot. All of them, however, seem unlikely for a federal government suffering from a budget so badly out of balance.

Laying a New Legal Foundation

For twenty years, the focus in school funding equity has been upon legal action in state courts. In the 1973 Rodriguez decision, the Supreme Court, by a five to four vote, declared that education was a state, not a federal responsibility. Rather than focusing upon new efforts to overturn that decision, or the even more unlikely prospect (under the increasingly conservative presidencies of the last two decades) of shifting the membership of the Court to achieve a different outcome, equity advocates turned back to state governments. Outcomes in these state courts have been mixed, though the most recent cases have mostly been favorable to the plaintiffs. In several states (Alabama and Missouri), the problem has been so bad that the state government has acted without even appealing the trial court's finding of unconstitutionality.

However, the courts have been less favorable in a number of other states, including Illinois. In this state, the Attorney General, now a candidate for Governor, defended the state by saying there is no constitutional protection for school children in Illinois. He has simply dismissed the rights of school children to equal protection of the law. In his brief he asked the court to dismiss the school finance suit. In effect, he has argued that the state can treat children as unequally as it chooses; unfortunately the circuit court has agreed with him. The case was dismissed last year, but the dismissal is now on appeal, with oral arguments expected at the end of the year or early next year. I am sure the Attorney General hopes the case will not be argued until after the March primary elections.

With the new federal concern to assure that all children in the United States graduate from high school with the desired knowledge and skills incorporated in Goals 2000, a new opportunity to assure equity and adequacy in school funding is available. If students across this nation are to be expected to meet national achievement standards, even ones which are voluntarily established by each of the 50 states, students must be given an equal opportunity to learn that knowledge and those skills. Thus, a logical strategy is to include in the Goals 2000 legislation, or in the act reauthorizing ESEA, language that indicates the federal government now considers it a fundamental interest that students achieve the new high standards it is encouraging. Further, the federal government considers it a

fundamental right of each child living within these United States to receive an adequate and essentially equal opportunity to learn the knowledge and skills needed to meet the government's achievement objectives. Such an assertion by the federal government would be difficult to oppose politically, at least in open debate; further, it would have the advantage of not requiring huge federal expenditures immediately. It would, however, provide a new opportunity to extend the protections of the 14th Amendment to all children, nationwide.

An interesting twist on this issue is being played out in Chicago this morning. A federal judge has declared that the constitutional rights of minority students in that city would be infringed upon if the school district were to be shut down due to inadequate funding. Thus far, he has only taken the step of issuing a Temporary Restraining Order preventing the implementation of a state law that requires that the schools be shut if the budget is not balanced. In effect, he has ruled that sanctions that punish disadvantaged students rather than improperly acting politicians and school and union leaders are unconstitutional, if the children involved belong to a protected class. Since minority children are disproportionately disadvantaged by the inequities in most state school finance systems, Judge Kocoras may be opening up a new line of litigation, featuring federal intervention to assure adequate educational opportunities for these children. Today, the judge must decide whether to enter a preliminary injunction that would be precedent setting in its effect, rather than merely *ad hoc* and not appealable.

Conclusion

It is unlikely, given the federal government's current budget imbalance, that the federal government would be ready to put its own resources into righting the wrong of school funding inequity. Thus, while we should not blindly discount the long-term possibilities of a major federal role in the funding of public education, the more likely immediate strategies are those which seek to fashion better targeted sanctions against the adults in states that provide inadequate and inequitable educational opportunities to their students and those strategies which would seek to provide new legal groundwork to assure the extension of the equal protection of the laws to all children, in so far as the funding of their public schools is concerned.

I thank you for the opportunity to share with you our concerns and our hopes for federal action. Once again, we commend you for your decision to hold these hearings and to locate them in East St. Louis. After all, it is the children who attend this school who most desperately need the assistance and protection of the federal government.

---

[2] Excludes special categorical support for handicapped or economically disadvantaged children.

[3] The income and tax data presented here are drawn from the *Tax Climate* publication of the Taxpayers Federation of Illinois.

[4] *A Far Cry From Fair*, 1992.

[5] Published by the EdEquity Coalition, 1991.

[6] I was privileged to be an expert witness on behalf of the St. Louis Public Schools, one of the Plaintiff-Intervenors in the Missouri school finance suit.

[7] *Chicago Tribune*, October 1, 1993, Section 1, page 5.

[8] To that end, we support the Department of Education's recommendation to increase the proportion of Chapter I funds dedicated to concentration grants to 50 percent and the higher floor for qualifying for these grants. However, we would urge the government to forego its enchantment with counties for determining eligibility, which only makes sense in states with county-wide school districts. Instead, the focus should be on individual schools; at the very least, the government should work directly with individual school districts.

[9] Activists in Chicago, fearful of top-down, imposed single solutions while in the midst of a bottom-up, school based effort at school reform, share this distrust.

Senator SIMON. Ms. Watkins?

Ms. WATKINS. Good morning, Senator Simon, Mr. Boyd, the staff with whom I have spoken several times the last week, other members of the board of education, our superintendent, other members of the educational arena, students, and concerned parents.

First of all, I need to make a correction. I am not a biology teacher. I am a physical-science teacher. I teach primarily the physical sciences. At the present time, I am trying to teach earth science and fundamentals of science, which is a basic science course, to our students.

I have been in this district for 26 years, and it is with that type of background that I would like to address the committee specifically as a teacher and a department chairperson.

In spite of the fact that the State of Illinois is demanding goals assessment programs and school improvement plans, which must document specifically whom we teach and what we teach, along with the revelation of appalling scores of U.S. students in science and all other disciplines, I still have hope.

I still teach to touch lives. I do it in a firm, fair, and consistent manner to the best of my ability. I would like to think that additional funding for science in our school district will certainly improve teacher morale and effectiveness as we strive to attain academic excellence and scientific literacy for all students.

My belief is based on the premise that the funds go specifically to the classroom in the form of equipment and supplies on a fair and equitable basis. I think you visited our building this morning. If you reached the second floor, you were able to see that many of those classrooms are not properly furnished. All laboratories and classrooms should be equipped with state-of-the-art equipment. I heard you ask Angela and the other young lady if they had used computers. There should be computers in every science classroom. Not only that, facilities should be there to safely store or house chemicals and jointly shared materials. There should be enough supplies to accommodate all students for hands-on activities, which is one of the things that we have been working toward in the State of Illinois to help achieve those assessment outcomes.

I worked this summer on a kit, a hands-on activities kit that we call hazardous waste, and I dare say I don't have the funds to purchase kits for every teacher in this district. It is a good kit, but we don't have the funds to purchase them.

We need access to replaceable supplies that are often depleted, a satisfactory means of distributing supplies to the person requisitioning such, and a guarantee that the requisitioned supplies or replaceable items be made available when needed.

We need to work smarter, not necessarily longer, by monitoring the efficiency of our staff from a two-fold perspective—productivity in reaching our desired outcomes and prevention in the depletion of our most important resources, both tangible and human—or we are going to deplete our teachers. Thus, the need to permit those persons placed in leadership roles to function maximally in their field of expertise, it is vitally important that those persons have time also allocated to them to assist other teachers who might be in need, to properly train laboratory assistants so that we can

maximize the time on task that our students have for performing hands-on activities.

At this time, thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I hope that I have been of some benefit to you.

Senator SIMON. I thank you, Ms. Watkins.

[Letter follows:]

Honorable Paul Simon, U. S. Senator
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
Washington, D. C. 20510-6300

Dear Senator Simon:

In response to your fax dated September 29, 1993, 5:44 p.m., let it be known that I am speaking strictly from the perspective of a classroom science teacher and departmental chairperson.

In spite of the fact that the State of Illinois is demanding Goals Assessment Programs and School Improvement Plans which must document specifically whom we teach and what we teach along with the revelation of appalling scores of U. S. students in science and all other disciplines, I still have hope. I still teach to touch lives in a firm, fair, and consistent manner. I would like to think that additional funding for Science in our school district will certainly improve teacher morale and effectiveness as we strive to attain academic excellence and scientific literacy for all students.

My belief is based on the premise that the funds go specifically to the classroom in the form of equipment and supplies on a fair and equitable basis. All laboratories and classrooms should be equipped with "state of the art" equipment and/or apparatus; facilities to safely store or house chemicals and jointly shared materials; enough supplies to accommodate all students for hands-on-activities; access to replaceable supplies that are often depleted; a satisfactory means of distributing supplies to the person requisitioning such; and a guarantee that the requisitioned supplies or replaceable items be made available when needed.

We need to work smarter not necessarily longer by monitoring the efficiency of our staff from a two-fold perspective: productivity in reaching desired student outcomes and prevention in the depletion of our most important resources (tangible and human). Thus, the need to permit those persons placed in leadership roles to function maximally in their field of expertise. It is vitally important that those persons have time allocated to assist other teachers and properly train laboratory assistants to maximize time-on-task for students performing hands-on-activities.

Sincerely,

Annie R. Watkins

Senator SIMON. Professor Baden?

Mr. BADEN. My name is Don Baden. I am a professor and associate dean at SIU, Edwardsville. I am currently serving as director of Project Caring, which is a federally funded, comprehensive school improvement program for Lansdowne and the Lansdowne community.

First I would like to express my thanks, and I think the thanks of the people in this school, for your coming here. I think the fact that a United States Senator would take the time to hold a hearing at this school has already made a difference in the lives of these students. So thank you.

I would like to talk about Lansdowne specifically, but Lansdowne's exist all over this State and all over this country, and so hopefully we can see the transfer of what is being talked about here.

Two years ago, Lansdowne Junior High School was failing as an educational institution. Ninety percent of its students operate below grade level norms in math and reading on State and national achievement tests. Over 70 percent of the students who begin at Lansdowne do not graduate from high school in East St. Louis within a 6-year period. Last year, only 10 percent of the 9th graders were eligible to start school because they hadn't taken their required school physical.

Forty-five percent of the students at Lansdowne were absent last year from 15 to 142 days. Few of the students have had any interaction with computers in the past. The only computers in the building until this year were reserved for a remedial program in reading. There are no science laboratories. The cooking room has no stoves. The physical environment of the school was deteriorating with paint peeling, restrooms not working, many of the classrooms cold during the winter from unrepaired windows. I think all of us have read Kozol's "Savage Inequalities." Chapter 1, as you know, dealt with East St. Louis, and Lansdowne was highlighted in his book.

The key question, I think, is how can this exist, even though a fair amount or large amounts of State and Federal dollars come into East St. Louis. How are these conditions allowed to exist, or how have they come to exist? And I would like to give my perceptions of that and then what a Federal program is doing to address these, and perhaps some things that might be done.

First, in my opinion, the issue is much broader than the issues just of educational expenditures. The lack of resources in the community for employment, for housing, for health care, and other basic needs make the school district the largest employer in the community. The reality of being an employment agency I think makes the district leadership extremely susceptible to politically based demands for jobs in the community. Oftentimes political needs outweigh educational needs as a determining factor in the decisionmaking process in the district.

The lack of employment also leads to a lack of belief in the efficacy of education. Few students in Lansdowne or their parents seek education as a way out of their economic plight. Successful economic role models in the community do not achieve that position because of their educational attainment, but because of their entre-

preneurial skills, both legal and illegal. Students see little reason to stay in school or to work hard if they are here.

Schooling processes become one of low expectations and social promotion from one grade to the next, resulting in students who advance and oftentimes graduate with few marketable skills.

Third, State and Federal attempts at improvement often, I think, over-emphasize standardized test scores, which focus on rote memorization rather than on meaningful skills, critical thinking, and problem solving.

The curriculum currently used in the schools is often irrelevant to the students. They are interested in community street-based issues which they see as relevant. The teachers, however, are not that familiar or in many cases not as aware of those issues as the students. Given that mismatch, many classes are seen as meaningless by the students while the teachers are often frustrated by the students' lack of interest in a traditional curriculum.

The lack of parental involvement or even sometimes interest in the school, especially at the secondary level, makes home/school cooperation very difficult. The preponderance of interactions between parents and school at a school like Lansdowne is for discipline issues and creates a very hostile environment, oftentimes, between parents and school. Also, the lack of after-school, weekend, and summer activities for the children of Lansdowne eliminates the possibility for effective continuity in education between the school and the community.

Finally, all the numerous efforts to improve the lives of students and families exist in East St. Louis through social agencies, health agencies. There is little coordination of this effort. Turf-minding and the building of empires oftentimes, I think, replaces the concerns for the needs of the children. While some families at Lansdowne may receive services from six or seven different social agencies, others receive none, and so it is many times a lack of access.

I would like to talk just for a minute about what Project Caring is and perhaps what can be done by the Federal Government.

Project Caring was established and received funding a year ago from the Urban Community Service Program, the Higher Education Act. It was designed to provide comprehensive educational, social, and health services to this community and also a similar one in St. Louis. Specifically the project is attempting to increase achievement and attendance here at Lansdowne, to encourage collaborative provision of social services, and improve the health conditions.

Some of the things that we have done in the last year: In education, we have tried to create a community of learners by creating teams of teachers who are working with smaller groups of children. Teachers are increasingly involved in the decisionmaking process of the school, suggesting solutions to problems faced in the building. We have set up a mentoring program which now serves or will be serving about 100 of the 700 students at Lansdowne, the mentors coming from school, community, and business leaders.

The social needs, the Project Caring social service staff works on a regular basis with approximately 850 of the students at

Lansdowne, trying to work with existing agencies with the families in trying to deal with the problems which the students have.

In the health arena, last spring the project sponsored a health clinic here at the school. Because of that, about 70 percent of the 9th graders started school this year rather than 10 percent the previous year because they got their physicals here.

A community center has been established in a neighborhood church to provide recreational tutoring and educational services. I would like to be able to say that because of Project Caring education conditions have dramatically improved at Lansdowne, but that is not really true. Class sizes have increased this year to 35 students because of the State-mandated cuts on the district. We have been in school for 5 or 6 weeks. We still have three or four classrooms which are being served by substitutes who are not adequately prepared to teach those classes. Books and supplies continue to be inadequately supplied. Teachers still have to buy most of their supplies, have to pay for xerox copies for use in their classroom.

This didn't happen just certainly overnight. This has happened over many years. I think positive things are occurring, though. The orderliness in the school, which is a prerequisite to learning, has increased dramatically, I think due to the leadership of the principal, Cornelius Perry, who came last year, and his associates, and hopefully in some part to Project Caring. The teaching staff, many of whom have been here for 10 to 35 or 40 years, I think, expressed a very positive, growing willingness to work with us in initiatives such as mentoring and school clubs programs.

Renovation efforts in the building, both by the district and by Project Caring, have given the students a sense that someone cares about their schools. We do have two computers rooms now in the school. Hopefully this year all students will have computer instruction.

What can be done by the Federal Government? Perhaps some things. One, the Federal Government could demand or should demand, I think, coordination of Federal education support to urban school districts. A school district like East St. Louis now has Federal funding for reading, science, math, drug education, career education, technology education, and I am sure a number of other things. Each of those becomes independent programs rather than a coordinated effort, perhaps something which would be more of a grant rather than categorical funding.

I think in urban schools especially, year-round schooling needs to be explored. I think the agricultural model obviously makes no sense in the East St. Louis community, and what is lost during that 3 or 4 months of summer and the period before and after that sets students back.

There needs to be a creative assistant to the personnel needs of urban schools. I am encouraged by President Clinton's youth service program, a program for using retired military NCO's and officers in urban schools. I think those both have promise in terms of improving some of the personnel needs.

I think there needs to be an encouragement with the States by the Federal Government coordinated in the delivery of social services. There are programs such as Walbridge in St. Louis, our pro-

gram, and some others around the country who are trying to begin to do this. Currently social agencies really are competing for aid to the students. There needs to be support and cooperation between the agencies.

I think the time is ripe for renewed Federal commitment to urban education. About one mile from here, a former Catholic high school is being transformed into a State prison. That transformation epitomizes the choice we have. We can either invest in education in urban areas, or we can invest in prisons. I think we all know what the choice can be.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Baden follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DONALD J. BADEN

My name is Donald Baden and I am a Professor and Associate Dean of the School of Education of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville in Edwardsville, Illinois. I am currently serving as Project Director of Project CARING, a comprehensive school improvement program serving the children and families of the Lansdowne community of East St. Louis, Illinois and the Stevens community of St. Louis, Missouri. I would like to share my perceptions of the educational conditions in this community and the impact which a federal program is having on these conditions.

Two years ago, Lansdowne Junior High School was failing as an educational institution. Over 90% of its students were operating below grade level norms on state and national achievement tests. Over 70% of its seventh graders did not graduate from an East St. Louis High School within the six years from entry into the school. Only 10 % of its ninth graders were starting school on time each fall because the other 90% had not completed the requisite school physical prior to admission. Forty-five percent of its students were absent from 15 to 142 days of school last year. Few if any students had any regular interaction with computer based instruction as the two computers which were in the building were used for remedial skill instruction. The physical environment of the school was deteriorating with paint peeling, restrooms not working, and many classrooms cold from unrepaired windows. Jonathan Kozol dramatically highlighted the plight of the children attending Lansdowne in the first chapter of his book, Savage Inequalities.

Joblessness, poverty, inadequate health care, underperforming schools, substandard housing and crime all have devastating effects upon children. These effects produce a cycle of disadvantage which perpetuates itself from generation to generation in the East St. Louis and other communities.

The key question is how this situation can exist in the light of large state and federal expenditures in the district which place the district at a per pupil expenditure higher than the state average. The following are some of my perceptions.

1.The issue is much broader than the issue of educational expenditures. The lack of resources in the community for employment, for housing, for health care and for other basic needs makes the school district the largest employer in the community. The reality of being an employment agency makes the district leadership extremely susceptible to politically based demands for jobs from the community. Political needs often outweigh educational needs as the determining factor in the decision making process in the district.

2.The lack of employment also leads to a lack of belief in the efficacy of education. Few students or their parents see education as the way out of their economic plight. Successful economic role models in the community often do not achieve that position because of educational attainment but rather because of their entrepreneurial skills, both legal and illegal. Students see little reason to stay in school or to work hard if they are there. The schooling process becomes one of few expectations and social promotion from one grade to the next resulting in students who advance and graduate with few marketable skills.

3. State and federal attempts at improvement often overemphasize standardized tests which focus on rote memorization of relatively meaningless skills as opposed to fostering teaching strategies which focus on critical thinking and problem solving.

4. The curriculum currently used in the schools is irrelevant to many of the students while the community/street based issues which the students see as relevant is often unknown to most of the teachers in the school. Given this mismatch, many classes are seen as meaningless by the students while the teachers sit frustrated by the student lack of interest in traditional curricula.

5.The lack of parental interest and involvement in the schools, especially at the secondary level, makes home-school cooperation in education virtually non-existent. The preponderance of interactions between school and home relates to the misbehavior of the student making for a hostile environment between the two groups.

6.The lack of afterschool, weekend and summer activities for kids eliminates the possibility for effective continuity in education between the school and the community.

7.Although numerous efforts to improve the lives of the students and their families exist, there is little coordination of these efforts. Turf minding and the building of empires replaces concern for the needs of the children. While some families may receive services from six or seven agencies or programs, others receive none because the system rewards non coooperation for both the clients and the providers.

I would like to address what is being done by Project CARING and what could or should be done by the federal government.

To address this crisis, a consortium of local universities, social and health agencies, area business leaders, and community organizations led by Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and School District #189 in East St. Louis have entered into a partnership agreement designed to address the problems at Lansdowne. Seen initially as an educational partnership, it was evident that the

children of Lansdowne were at risk not because of inherent educational deficiencies, but because of a myriad of educational, social and health problems which made learning very difficult. The members of this consortia have committed themselves to breaking this cycle in the Lansdowne community. In the words of Lisbeth Schorr: "It lies within our reach to change the futures of disadvantaged children...," by developing a comprehensive spectrum of services focussing on the child within the context of the family.

Project CARING was established and received funding a year ago from the Urban Community Service Program under Part A, Title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. CARING is designed to provide comprehensive educational, social and health services to this community and a similar one in St. Louis. Specifically, the project is attempting to increase achievement and attendance in the targeted schools, encourage collaborative provision of social services and improve the health conditions of children and families in the area. Let me briefly describe the key activities of the past year.

In the area of education, our goal has been to create a community of learners by creating teams of teachers and professional staff members committed to improving the quality of education received by the students. Teachers are increasingly involved in the decision making process in the school suggesting solutions to problems faced in the building. This process has helped to set up a mentoring program serving about 100 of the 700 students at Lansdowne. The goal of these effort is to provide increased motivaton for the students to stay in school and succeed. To help accomplish this, over 20 students from SIUE have chosen to complete their student teaching at Lansdowne in the past year.

To address the social needs of the students, the Project CARING social service staff works with over 150 of the Lansdowne students on a regular basis. The staff interacts on a daily basis with the teachers in identifying needs of students and how to address these needs. The staff also works closely with area agencies to prevent duplication of services to the students and their families.

The health staff of Project CARING meets immediate health needs of the students, identifies health problems, and works with the teachers in trying to proactively improve the health conditions of the children. Last spring the staff sponsored on site physical examinations and immunizations in conjunction with the local health authority so that ninth graders would be eligible to enter school on time this September. Over 75% did enter on time compared to the 10% in the past. years.

A community center has been established in a neighborhood church to provide recreational, tutoring, and educational services to children and their families after school, on weekends, and in the summer.

I would like to report that the educational environment and achievement of the students at Lansdowne has changed dramatically since our intervention, but I can't. Class sizes have increased this year to 35 students in each class because of budgetary reductions imposed by the state so that the district could balance its budget. A number of classes continue to be served by substitute rather than by more, fully certified teachers even after one month of the school year. Books and supplies continue to be inadequately supplied. While Project CARING has been able to provide support to meet some of the needs of the teachers, many teachers still have to use their own funds to buy supplies and to make copies of instructional materials for the students.

The overwhelming challenges faced by the professionals at Lansdowne did not come into being in the past year and they won't disappear in the three year life of this project. However, there are positive things occurring. Orderliness in the school, a prerequisite for learning, has increased dramatically in the past year due to the leadership of a new building principal, Cornelius Perry, and his associates, and, I believe, in some part to the presence of Project CARING. The teaching staff, many of whom have been at Lansdowne for the past 10 to 35 years, have exhibited a growing willingness to participate in Project CARING initiatives such as the mentoring program and a School Clubs period. The students seem to have an increased sense of pride in their school due in part to renovation efforts of the school district and by beautification efforts underway by Project CARING. Two computer rooms have been equipped by Project CARING so that all students in the school now receive computer instruction on a weekly basis.

The problems faced by the children and families of Lansdowne often appear intractable and insurmoutable. They have not only existed for the past twenty years, they have grown. Efforts to correct them have been sporadic, at best. A significant concern I have is that Project CARING will become another on the list of federal projects that have come and gone. Change does not occur in three year blocks of time. Institutions such as schools and social agencies must be transformed to more effectively involve the communities in which they exist. All facets of society must work together if we are to change the odds for children and families at risk. Project CARING begins that process of change. My concern is whether we have the strength and courage to commit to long term institutional change.The problems of Lansdowne are not just a problem for East St. Louis but are a problem for the entire St. Louis metropolitan area, for the state of Illinois and for the entire country. We have begun. May we continue? What can be done at the federal level to succeed in this effort?

1.The federal government should demand coordination of all federal education support to urban school districts. Perhaps targeted block grants combining existing restrictive programs could replace current categorical funding.

2.Year round schooling or at least year round support of educational efforts in the community needs to be piloted as a federal/state initiative.

3.Creative assistance to the personnel needs of urban schools. Promising initiatives such as President Clinton's Youth Service program, the use of retired military NCO's and officers in urban schools, and urban community service efforts exist. The federal government must demand coordination of these efforts rather than allowing the creation of new local patronage empires.

4.Encourage with the states coordinated delivery of social services through the schools. A number of promising efforts such as Walbridge in St. Louis, this Project CARING, as well as other programs around the country need to be institutionalized. Currently DCFS, Public Aid, CHASI, and numerous other public and private programs compete for clients. State leadership with federal support is necessary to change this thinking.

The time is ripe for renewed federal commitment to urban education. About one mile from here, a former Catholic high school is being converted into a state prison. That transformation epitomizes our societal choice. We can either invest in education in urban areas or we can invest in prisons. I think we all know what our choice must be.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Senator SIMON. I thank you. If I may just comment on your last observation, we have invested money in prisons thinking this is a way to solve crime. What is very interesting, in the year 1970 we had 134 people per 100,000 in our prisons, and then we got on this kick that we are going to put more people in prison and then we are going to solve our crime problem that way. Today we have 455 people per 100,000 persons, far more than any other country. South Africa is second with 311. Canada has 109. We clearly are looking in—we are putting billions every year into new prisons, and you don't need to go any further than the State of Illinois to find that. And we are neglecting the causes out there.

I would also like to underscore what you have said, that you cannot expect schools in isolation to solve the problems when we stockpile the poor into the central city in Chicago, when in East St. Louis—and I spent much of my life in this area. I go back to the years when this was a largely African American city but with all white leadership, and they were interested not in the community too often, but in who controlled the gambling, who controlled the prostitution, and you didn't have the interest in building the community that should have been there. And we are paying for that today.

I should recall this, but what is the per-pupil expenditure here in East St. Louis? Do either Ms. Watkins or Don Baden or Mr. Duckworth, if you are still here——

Mr. BADEN. Mr. Hess has it. It is about $3,000, but that doesn't include the programs for—you know, chapter programs and special ed, which I think raises it to, what, around $5,500?

Dr. HESS. Yes, about $5,500 when you include the aid to the disadvantaged. But the basic aid is only about $3,100. The State itself says that there ought to be at least $3,900 to provide an adequate education. So even by the State's own standard, the State is not providing enough.

Senator SIMON. And the tax base that you referred to, Dr. Hess, the reality is that when you get that tax base above a certain level, it becomes impossible to attract industry into a community to build a tax base. That is where we are today.

Ms. Watkins, I don't want to wish this upon you, but if you were suddenly a member of the U.S. Senate——

Ms. WATKINS. Oh, my goodness. [Laughter.]

Senator SIMON. [Continuing.] What would you be trying to do in terms of what the schools in East St. Louis need?

Ms. WATKINS. First of all, I think we need to do something that would permit our students to do a lot more critical thinking than they presently do. That is where I would start.

Senator SIMON. And can you explain what you mean by that?

Ms. WATKINS. By this, I mean a lot of the things that they do, they just do it without any thought about it. A perfect example—and I am not trying to be critical of any particular kid. I had a student say to me the other day in the classroom, I asked about her notes, and she said to me, "I don't have those notes, so I can't participate today." I said, "Well, you should have been in class." And she said to me, "Well, it is not my fault." So I said, "Whose fault is it?" And her response to me was, "It is God's fault."

Now, there was no critical thinking there. That was an excuse. That was an option. That was a way out. I don't want this from my students. And at that point, I said to her, "Well, we will discuss this some other time because, you know, God did not cause you to be ill," or whatever the problem was. Students need to think critically about what they are saying before they just jump up and say something.

A set of values needs to be instilled from the home. If I can get respect from students in my classroom and can get them to understand that you must respect each person because they are human beings, then I have more time to spend in the classroom than I do on disciplinary problems. Just getting kids to think through a situation, if I give you a laboratory activity to do, don't just write something down just to be writing an answer. Think about it.

Are you being honest in your reporting of the information that you saw? Things that cause them to think critically is something I would like to do.

Senator SIMON. One of the other members of the panel—I forget which one—mentioned more parental involvement.

Ms. WATKINS. Involvement.

Senator SIMON. One of the difficulties is a lot of parents feel inadequate. You know, one of the problems is adult illiteracy that we have got to face up to and some other problems in our society. And a lot of parents have just given up along with their students.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, that is true.

Senator SIMON. Any observations you have on the parental involvement side of this?

Ms. WATKINS. I suppose I should have a lot because I have two children of my own and four grandchildren that we are trying to educate.

I find that many times the students are given two sets of things to deal with. We say one thing to them, for them to do, but we do something totally different ourselves.

I used to think that it was the young ladies in this district that we had to attract, and I think if I had been able to do that in 1976, we might have done a little better. I wrote a proposal for this district for a dean of women, and I wanted to address the problems of the young ladies because I could see then the decline of the young ladies' behavior. And I thought that behavior modification might be something to work with. And, of course, it was not carried to fruition, so I think we lost those young ladies.

I think if we can reach our young ladies, even today, that would be the direction in which to go, because if the young ladies have this high self-esteem, then we can cause them to—they will demand from the young men and the other people in the community that they get that respect also. But we don't have that, and a lot of that is because the building—the schools are not properly funded for them to actually grow up believing that they can be better than they are.

Senator SIMON. That spark of hope is missing.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, that spark of hope is missing for them.

Senator SIMON. And when we don't adequately maintain buildings and do other things, we are not conveying the right kind of message, are we?

Ms. WATKINS. No, we are not. We are sending mixed signals.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Jung, you in a sense kind of went through the same experience that Jonathan Kozol did. I don't know if you read his book, "Savage Inequalities," but he went from—I forget, I think it was a poor school to a wealthy district, or maybe it was the other way around. I forget. But in a sentence or two, what is the difference between serving in a wealthy district—or not a wealthy district, but one reasonably well financed and one that isn't?

Mr. JUNG. I think probably the biggest difference that I have seen is that we have a few more resources that we can allow teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to explore ways to improve their teaching, explore ways to involve parents in programs. The program that I was thinking of when you mentioned parents, in Missouri we have a program called Parents as First Teachers, where educators from the local school district go out to the school and help parents understand a child's development and help them encourage that development. That type of a program is going to be very——

Senator SIMON. And as I understand the Missouri program, you do that not when a child enrolls in the kindergarten or first grade.

Mr. JUNG. It is from birth.

Senator SIMON. From birth, which I think really does make a difference. And these things that you talk about, do they make a difference in terms of the expectations and the development of young people?

Mr. JUNG. Exactly. The parents feel more comfortable with the school. They feel like they can come in and work with the teachers because they have ever since their child has been born. It is with the teacher they have been working with. They feel more confident in dealing with their children, that they can help them with the problems that they are having. And if they can't help them, they know where they can go rather than feeling a sense of hopelessness.

Senator SIMON. Fred Hess, you have been dealing with this problem for a long time. In addition to everything else, how do we get parents involved? And how is that tied in with this basic question of equity in financing we are talking about?

Dr. HESS. I think, quite directly, we have a very minimalist program in Illinois that allows support to disadvantaged children only. That program was written out of the legislation by the General Assembly this past year. Fortunately, the Governor, in his amendatory veto, took the elimination of that program out of the bill. So we are able to maintain it. But I think we do need to look at those kinds of supports for direct involvement.

In Chicago, we are trying to do something much more directly in terms of giving the schools back to the parents, giving them the ability to run schools through local school councils, and, therefore, to try and overcome this sense that the schools are just foreign places, and hopefully also to reconnect them into their communities the way Project Caring is trying to reconnect this school into its community.

I think that is a critical juncture. The Federal Government could be very helpful here if we could get the various bureaucracies in

the Federal Government to begin to coordinate their activities and encourage the local manifestations of their departments to work across the lines so that Health and Human Services and Education and the Department of Labor all begin to bring their programs into coordination.

My understanding is the Secretaries of each of those Departments are certainly inclined in that direction. The problem becomes the middle-level bureaucrats.

I would like to comment on one other dimension. You mentioned that the ESEA reauthorization is coming up. One of the proposals that has come forth from the administration last week is that the way in which we fund Federal Chapter 1 funds should be altered. This is aside from how much money is put into it currently. The money is very diffuse, and some of the most wealthy school districts get some of that money because they have a few low-income kids. But there is a proposal from the Department that in the future, Federal Chapter 1 funds should be divided equally between general support to all low-income kids in the country and concentrated support to school districts with higher proportions of low-income kids. So the school districts that have half of their kids, as Mr. Jung has in his class, that would qualify for services would get extra funds. That would be tremendously beneficial for school districts with lots of low-income kids, like East St. Louis or like Chicago or like Rittner. So I think that is clearly one of the proposals that we would want to support.

I think one of the other things that we might be aware of, we are meeting on a historic day because today in Chicago the Chicago Board of Education goes before Judge Kocoras, a Federal judge, to ask him to keep the Chicago public schools open because there has been a lack of funding that is available for the children of that city. They are going in on a civil rights clause, basically saying that these children have been segregated and their civil rights have been violated, and we can't remedy the violation of their civil rights if the school district itself doesn't operate.

If Judge Kocoras should grant the preliminary injunction that he is being asked to grant today, that would move his action from being a temporary ad hoc, let's try and help this thing along, which is what his action has meant to date, into a precedent-setting and reviewable proposal. It might give us another set of legal grounds to begin to look at how we adequately treat children.

I was fortunate to get a tour of this school this morning. One of the comments that my guide made to me was that—he was showing the in-school suspension section and was showing some books that they had received from the Clayton school district. Clayton is one of the wealthy suburbs of St. Louis. And it occurred to me, wouldn't it be wonderful if at some point we started funding school districts on the basis of the needs of kids so that Clayton would get the hand-me-down textbooks instead of the children who need the extra assistance having to live on hand-me-downs? There is something desperately wrong about what we are doing in this country.

Senator SIMON. There just is no question. On the coordination, one small experiment will take place. I have got an amendment adopted affecting Indian reservations which, as of October 1st, permits the Tribal Governments to coordinate all services being pro-

vided on the reservations. I understand there is a little bit of chaos going on right now as people try and figure out how they are going to do this. But one of the problems in East St. Louis and Chicago and everywhere else is the problem that you referred to, Professor; that is, this lack of coordination between the various agencies of government who ought to be working together, and then all of a sudden you find a school that doesn't have a counselor as a result, when, you know, absolutely that is essential.

Dr. HESS. The Federal Chapter 1 reauthorization would encourage that. Unfortunately, it does it by taking money out of the current usages. So it is going to encourage some innovation, but it is going to take it away from the basic services that the money now provides. We have got to find a way to not do that. We need to supplement that encouragement rather than detract from the existing services to make that happen.

Kentucky has moved on that dimension in their school reform act and now has community service agencies at every school where more than 20 percent of the kids come from low-income families as a mandated part of the State funding formula for education. That might be some of the kinds of things that we should encourage in States across the country.

Senator SIMON. Professor Baden made one other observation about the need for year-round schools. In visiting East St. Louis High School, one of the things I was encouraged by was the fact that you have some Saturday voluntary programs in math there. It is a just a small thing, but in the Chicago school, for example, the schools just aren't used as a resource for the community beyond the very limited hours, which is really unfortunate.Obviously it has an impact. In Japan, you go to school 243 days a year. In Germany, you go 240 days a year. We go to school 180 days a year, in theory so our children can go out and harvest the crops.

Well, there aren't too many children in East St. Louis or where I live, near Route 1, Makanda, IL, out harvesting the crops. We have been thinking a little bit about putting some kind of an incentive to schools that would even go from 180 days to 210. Maybe $100 extra per pupil or something. The difficulty with doing this is the schools that are the wealthier schools are more able to take advantage of this.

Any observations, Professor Baden, on how we do this so that, in fact, East St. Louis and Chicago and Pittsburgh and the places that really need help get help?

Mr. BADEN. Obviously one of the difficulties, as one of the girls said, is how even with 180 school days the school is a very uncomfortable place to be for 3 or 4 weeks of the year because of the heat. It is almost impossible to learn. So that would require a capital outlay that obviously in a building like this would be a very difficult thing to do. But there should be some ways in which even if it is not a replication of the rest of the school year—there are kids that come from the school across the street, Hawthorn, who come here and who start the 7th grade still unable to read very effectively, if able to read at all. There needs to be some type of an intervention, you know, before they get into their secondary school, as well as earlier times, maybe some one-on-one types of things.

I have been thinking of the President's youth service initiative. If we could take a group of 20 college students who could sit down with 3 or 4 kids apiece for an hour a day during the summer, I think they could catch those kids up enormously with that kind of intensive education. So there perhaps are some mechanisms available, but it is——

Senator SIMON. There are some mechanisms at SIU which, way back when, when I was in the State legislature, I tried to get that placed in East St. Louis rather than Edwardsville, meaning no disrespect to Edwardsville, but I felt it could have been very important to the future of East St. Louis. But to get volunteers or to get college students who would get some credit.

My wife is here. She is a volunteer tutor in a school in Washington, DC. Those kinds of voluntary efforts are extremely important.

Mr. BADEN. We have begun to encourage more and more of our students in education, as well as some other pupils, to do their work at Lansdowne, and it certainly is an amazingly worthwhile experience for them once we get them over their concerns about, you know, I am not used to going into that kind of a community. Once they get here, they find out that kids have needs here just as they do in their home town, and their experience is extremely valuable as a result.

Senator SIMON. Any final observations on that question or anything else, a chance to put in final words of wisdom before this hearing adjourns? Mr. Jung?

Mr. JUNG. You asked other panel members what they would do if they were in the U.S. Senate. Considering that the amount of money needed for defense is not as great as it once was, there could be a real push for redirecting and reordering our priorities. I think that would be one of those areas that we would push for, and I would hope that if I were in your position, I would be pushing for more creative ways to get the money to the schools, directly to the classrooms, giving some incentive in that form, or at least a portion of it in that form, rather than traditional ways.

Senator SIMON. Both you and Ms. Watkins used the phrase that aid should go directly to the classroom.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes, I did.

Senator SIMON. Are you suggesting that too much of it, we tend to get top heavy? And, Fred, you are an observer of the Chicago schools. Do we tend to get top heavy in administration in schools?

Ms. WATKINS. I think so. Personally I do, and the money does not reach the classroom where it needs to be.

Mr. BADEN. Part of that gets back, though, to the regulations which the Federal Government and the State governments set up to almost require that kind of control.

Senator SIMON. Yes.

Mr. BADEN. It is a vicious cycle.

Dr. HESS. But it is an assumption that we should be having somebody keeping track on the way we spend money because the way we spend money is more important than the results we get. And I think that is where Professor Klune's suggestion of turning the tables around, instead of assuming that there has got to be somebody in charge to tell everybody else how to spend the money, and that somebody in charge then becomes the focus of all the

problems that Don was pointing out of political patronage and so forth, if we put the money at the schools and made the school the unit of analysis rather than the school district or the country—God forbid the Federal Government continues to use counties for some unknown reason—get out of counties in Chapter 1 and let's get down to school districts at least. If we could make the unit closer down to the school and say to the schools you have the money and you decide how to use it, and what we are going to hold you accountable for is not how you use the money but what results you get, I think we will move a long way away from the current kind of dealing with mandates that don't make a lot of sense, developing a lot of resistance from school people. And you heard a lot of resistance today to mandates. At least I did from several of the witnesses. And allow people to have that control, and then they can decide. As Mr. Jung was pointing out, his school district has decided to put money into salaries. So he has got a decent salary, but he has no teacher aides and he doesn't have any supplies. And you don't have either.

Ms. WATKINS. Yes. And this is what I was talking about.

Mr. BADEN. And so if we get the money down at the school level, then let the teachers decide how they want to use that money and how they divide it up between salaries and supplies and so forth, get a different set of dynamics going on than some patronage chief deciding who to give jobs to and where to send the money, and that is what you get when you say we are going to control it by controlling how you spend it rather than on what your results are. So it flips the cycle around, and I know that is difficult because my city was one of the cities that engendered the focus on how you spend it, because we spent it so badly in the early years of the 1950's and 1960's. Congressman Hawkins was right to be concerned about how those moneys were being spent and whether they were going to the wrong kids.

Senator SIMON. If I may pursue that, in theory I don't argue with you. I don't mean this disrespectfully. There are a lot of fine school people here. But when I get specific, for example, 94-142, the aid to young people with disabilities, I frankly am unwilling just to give money to the schools and say you do with it as you will because I want to make sure those young people with disabilities get help. And you almost have to require—like the individual education plan that we have, personally I would like to see it for all students, not just for 94-142 students.

But when you get down to specifics, I don't want to see us lose ground in some of these areas. Any observations on that?

Dr. HESS. Well, I think the issue is to make sure that the civil rights are firmly established in law for service, that the children have the right to the service of what they need. We were hearing from Mr. Clayborne about the number of kids in special ed, and as I did a quick calculation, it sounds like 8 to 9 percent in East St. Louis. But when I rode from Springfield to Chicago on a plane a month ago with the superintendent in Winnetka, what he pointed out to me was that virtually all of his children do have IEP's whether they require special ed support from the State or not, because they have the money to do it and so they just do it and they don't care.

The other thing he pointed out was that while they have about 8 or 9 percent of their kids in special ed, 50 percent of the kids who attend Chicago schools would qualify for special ed in their school. But in our schools, only 8 or 9 percent of them qualify. There is a limitation on the percentage of your kids who can qualify in terms of practicalities. And so what you end up with is this limitation by guaranteeing the funds.

So I understand your concern, and I think that it is a good concern. What we have to do is find the legal recourse to force the school system to provide the services rather than tying the dollars to the kids. Because what ends up happening is you just get a lot of kids who don't get recognized. Chicago has been one of the worst districts in the country on that issue. I don't mean, you know, to say look at us and we will show you how to do it. But we do have Federal judges now who are willing to sit and say these kids are not getting the services they require; they must get those services even if it costs more than what the Federal Government and the State government together put in. It is a problem when the Feds don't put their share in and then the State doesn't put its share in, and the local districts have to come up with the difference. It is about $150 million in special ed costs the Chicago public schools alone put into their special ed programs that come out of local property taxes. So it is a problem.

But I think we have got to be more radical in rethinking the way we are doing it and find the protections in law rather than in funding streams.

Mr. BADEN. I don't think educators disagree with the need to serve handicapped children or all the other aim of the mandates, the thrust of them.

Senator SIMON. Right.

Mr. BADEN. But when you have such a limited amount of funds to work with, it becomes like a group of vultures picking over those morsels, and it becomes—you know, we fight with each other over those dollars rather than getting the adequate funding to keep that from being a problem.

Senator SIMON. Ms. Watkins, you get the final word.

Ms. WATKINS. OK. I share everyone's concern, but I am saying, as the classroom teacher, I know more about what I need in that classroom for the students that I am working with than someone else standing over there telling me here is $50 you can use for this. I know what I need. Let me decide what I need to work with those students, and then send it. Don't you tell me here is 15 cents and you do what you can with it. If I know what the kids need, let me have the wherewithal to teach those kids. They need supplies. They need equipment.

Senator SIMON. That is a good note to close on.

Mr. BOYD. May I comment and see if anyone can ask a question? Are you familiar how Title 1——

Senator SIMON. Can you identify yourself for the record here?

STATEMENT OF FRED BOYD, PRESIDENT, SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. BOYD. Fred Boyd, president of the school board.

Senator SIMON. Right.

Mr. BOYD. Are you familiar with how Title 1 money or Chapter 1 money is handled when it comes from Washington? Dr. Hess, would you explain that to the Senator? If not, I will do it.

Dr. HESS. You go ahead.

Mr. BOYD. Senator, it goes to Springfield first.

Senator SIMON. Right.

Mr. BOYD. And as a board member, we will be waiting some time as late as December before Chapter 1 money gets to us. We are using our regular general fund to pay all the expenses. I don't understand why the money has to go to Springfield, then to Belleville, then to East St. Louis. You look up and it is Christmas Eve and we have a payroll, and board members are walking the floor worrying about how to meet the bills, the income and so forth.

As a Senator, I would hope you would be concerned with cutting that situation out. They say we can't invest the money. I don't know why it goes to Springfield. They won't allow the local groups to invest the money. As Ms. Watkins has said, there should be a simple computer set up directed to Washington or wherever, where she can clock in when she has needs and cut all the red tape out of the program and all that type of thing and shifting paperwork back and forth. So as a Senator, I think it can be incumbent on you to look into the situation of processing and handling when we don't get our money until December. School starts in September. We have got to foot the bill until the money gets there, and that makes the board members and the superintendent walk the floor until Christmas time when you run out of money. You don't have your Chapter 1 money. It is tied up in Springfield somewhere. We have to call different people to try to loosen the money up. That is a concern of mine.

Sorry to interrupt.

Senator SIMON. No, no. We want you to interrupt. This is one of the things that we are going to be looking at when we examine the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, how we process things and are there more effective ways to do it.

We thank all of you for being here. I see two hands raised. Representative Wyvetter Younge, do you want to add anything here briefly? And if you can, again, identify yourself for the record here.

STATEMENT OF WYVETTER H. YOUNGE, STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Ms. YOUNGE. Thank you very much, Senator Simon. I want to thank you for coming to East St. Louis to School District 189 to inquire into the question as to in what ways the Federal Government can assist the State of Illinois and the district in improving and increasing the adequacy of the educational system here.

I don't want to talk about per capita amount and the various things that have been talked about here because I think that the testimony has been very good. What I want to try to talk about is the fact that I think that there has to be a different paradigm or a different frame of reference in reference to our consideration of the educational experience of the American child, particularly the child in District 189.

In other words, I think that we need some structural changes in the way Government works. I think we ought to change our focus

from educational funding to how do we build communities, how do we go about advancing the development process so that it will include not only the educational considerations, but it will include households, it will include private industry, it will improve not only government spending but improve the banks and the health system and all of the facets that these children and these educators and these families are coping with.

We have basically a breakdown in our society functioning here. We don't have a banking system. We don't have an employment system. We have a very, very poor housing environment. And what I am saying to you is the answer to the question as to how the Federal Government can help is to, number one, look at it more comprehensively and let us plan more comprehensively. Federal programs aren't working here. Federal programs are very, very nil to begin with. So little money comes into Illinois from the Federal Government to begin with. And you are very familiar with that.

So the issue number one is making available resources that really end up in a quality house, a job, a health center, a neighborhood that has some quality about it, health care. This school system is struggling in an abyss of denial of Federal resources. And so the issue should be changed and the discussion should be changed from a level of just the school funding to the quality of environment and the extent of the economic development process that is or is not occurring.

I think that we ought to change the way we look at things to demand a joint responsibility, a joint responsibility. We look at local school districts as custodians of money, but we should go back to a theory of joint responsibility first from the home, from the individuals who pay the taxes, and then the school, then the State, then the Federal Government. And I would like to ask you to come back for another hearing, a hearing that is well publicized so that the parents and the teachers and the principals and the President can have some opportunity to prepare. I heard about this hearing in the newspaper yesterday evening, and so there are a lot of things I'd like to say, but I hadn't really adequate notice.

I will journey on to say that I would like for you at your second hearing here to invite private industry to come in and talk about what private industry can do to help this school district, to help these parents seek employment for their young people. Unless we fund 641 and your Guaranteed Job Opportunity Act and bring some employment opportunities to these young people, this school district and every other school district that has large numbers of minority students is just struggling with a group of totally deprived young people who need resources.

So I think that the educational act ought to include some type of carrot that provides that if you give part of that 20 percent of money that you could give under 501(c)(3) institutions in lieu of taxes to the school district, we will give you some type of benefit or some type of incentive. We have large amounts of money that you pass laws about that could be going to economic development in inner cities and to school districts that is still being paid to the Federal Government. That money ought to be redirected through some type of amendment that would help schools and help in economic development.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

 3 9999 05982 558 6

I think that is what I wanted to say. There is no question but that we should shift from private real estate taxes for the funding of schools to State income taxes. And by doing that, we could raise the per capita expenditure, let's say, for 189 from $3,100, $3,900, to $4,500, $4,800. And I think that the issue is then shoring up the State government in some way to permit it to make that shift and to therefore give them more adequate education. The main thing I have tried to say is that we need to look to place the school funding problem into a context of a community development problem. We need to shift more money into the households of our struggling communities. We need to have a better program for the initiation and investment and the promulgation of the education of private business enterprise. We need here a banking system. We have no banking system because all the dilapidation is basically as a result of the fact that no loans have gone to this community. We need an expenditure of public funds for education and other government that integrates into a community economic development system. And we, of course, last do need a foreign trade, global trade, and the globalization of local economies.

What I am saying is that the context of what we are talking is incorrect. We need to make the context one element of an economic development program for this community.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator SIMON. All right. We thank you. Let me just add this is the Subcommittee on Education, so it is narrowly focused. But there is no question that we have to be looking at the total picture, and unless we move in more positive ways on the total picture, you can put all the money you have into schools and you are not going to be solving the problems of the community.

Senator SIMON. Yes, sir?

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL THOMPSON, JR., PARENT

Mr. THOMPSON. Senator Simon, my name is Samuel Thompson, Jr., and I am a parent. I have been into the school and involved with the schools for at least the last 5 or 6 years. It is hard for me to get anywhere when I go to the schools because I am treated as bad as a child is treated. And even though I am educated and even though I am an adult well over 40 years old, I am treated like a child by the teachers. I have spent more than 90 percent of the days this past year involved in the school, at the school, asking can I volunteer, asking can I participate, trying to show some insight into some of our problems.

I have two children in school, a girl and a boy. My daughter is treated fantastically, though she needs to have some—but my son is not. My daughter is capable of being a problem, and I don't see that in my son. My son is constantly tagged as a troublemaker. But as I have spent all this time, I have witnessed other young boys who have been degraded and assaulted and mistreated, not shown the same respect or concern as the young ladies have.

Now, I know my daughter. I know what she is capable of, and I am trying to understand how she is going to the same school and comes out smelling like a rose when my son does not. I am confused. I understand what Ms. Younge is saying. I think there should be a program called TQMS, Total Quality Management Sys-

tem. It involves everyone. It gives everyone a chance to say and get involved and take a responsibility for doing their share.

We have too many problems. We cannot police every one person. We have to find a system to help us police ourselves and get involved.

It is established that 10 to 20 percent of your budget, your operating budget, is lost if you do not have a total quality program. We could change ours to total quality life management system, but we are wasting dollars down the drain.

We have one of the main problems you mentioned about Michael Jordan's father, those two boys, white and black, same community, same school, if we could have done something about it. My son has been told in this school district to learn to fight by a teacher or get a skirt and become a cheerleader. I have one teacher—my son was dragged around the playground and beat up. One teacher informed him that he must be the problem. He was a 2nd grader being dragged around and beat up by a 6th grader. Where was the involvement and the control?

I told my son he had to believe in the teachers, and I let him down. And I have promised him now to never let him down. He came to me and he told me, he informed me. I was under the impression that for some reason everything was normal as it was when I went to school, that if I went to a teacher there would be someone to help me. But I have sat outside down the street from the playground, and I have witnessed teachers not getting involved, not taking the time and energy to criticize or stop. There is too much mayhem, there is too much danger on these playgrounds for me to teach my son not to fight. But then he goes to someone and he can't get help. Then when he turns around and becomes a fighter, they point a finger at him and say, "What's your problem?"

If you are not going to protect me, if I as a child am not safe, and I can't confide in you and have confidence in you to protect me, somehow or another I have got to protect myself. We have too many children running around with guns and too many children committing crimes. Where was the confidence and the security that they needed when they went for help? My son now, he is managing to get through all of this. But it is not just my son. I witnessed other young boys going through the same thing, not being taken seriously, not being shown the same concern. And I found out that our boys need to be talked to and treated like people just like our young girls. Their feelings can be hurt. They may build up callousness to the point where you can say anything and you can do almost anything to them, and they will still have this outward appearance that they are doing okay. But inside they are hurting.

I think too many young boys, good, good boys that want to participate and want to be a part, have nowhere to go for protection. So I think from what I have heard from several people here is fantastic. I think there should be another hearing where the parents can come, because there is something wrong, as an adult, educated adult in the corporate industry for 13 years and the military for 6, I should have some intelligence and I should get some respect that when I go in and confront an administrator or teacher, that I am not talked to as a child.

Senator SIMON. We thank you very much for being here. [Applause.]

We have talked about parental involvement, and your presence here is a tribute to you. We appreciate that.

Mr. BOYD. I have one more comment.

Senator SIMON. It will have to be very brief because I have to go grab a plane.

Mr. BOYD. About the census form, we are losing millions of dollars in this city because the census forms were not filled out. Do you have some sort of a mechanism to ensure that everyone fills out their census form? We are continuing to lose out each year because of that.

Senator SIMON. Well, the city or the school district or some other governmental entity in the county can do another census survey. It is expensive. But one of the realities in East St. Louis is another problem we didn't get into, that you have a declining population in East St. Louis, and that compounds some of your problems here. But we appreciate your presence here, Mr. President. We thank all the witnesses and everyone for being here. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:00 noon, the subcommittee was adjourned.]

○